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PROCEDINGS

(Teleconference - 4/22/2020)

(On record)

MR. DOOLITTLE: I'll do an initial roll call this morning. First I'll start with the court reporter, Tina, are you with us?

REPORTER: I am.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Tina.

I'll start with Fish and Wildlife Service, is Greg Siekaniec on line yet?

OPERATOR: He is not on line.


MR. STRIKER: Good morning.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Good morning, Don.

Good to hear you. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Gene Peltola.

MR. PELTOLA: Eee.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Good to hear you Gene.

Public member Rhonda Pitka, did you make it with us this morning yet.

MS. PITKA: Good morning.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Good morning, Rhonda.

Bureau of Land Management, Chad Padgett with us this morning.

(No comments)

MR. DOOLITTLE: We don't have Chad yet.

Public member Charlie Brower, are you with us Charlie.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Tom, Charlie's going to be a little late today.
MR. DOOLITTLE: He's going to be a little late?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, he's going to be a little late today, he had something come up and he said he'll chime in when he gets available so we could start without him.


MR. SCHMID: Yeah, good morning, Tom, I'm on.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Good to hear you Dave.

And, Tony, I hear you're on.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, I'm on.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay. So essentially waiting for Chad and waiting for Greg to get on, and Charlie we know will be a little late but we have quorum.

OPERATOR: And this is the Operator, I had received communication that Greg was having a difficult time joining in so I'm going to -- he provided his cell number and I'm going to go ahead and make an outbound call to him and see if we can get him on line.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay, thank you, Operator.

OPERATOR: You're welcome.

(Pause)

MR. DOOLITTLE: While we're waiting, too, I'll see if the State of Alaska, Ben Mulligan is on line.

MR. MULLIGAN: Good morning, the State is here.

MR. DOOLITTLE: All right. Ben, we're starting out better than yesterday, that's good.

I'll go through the Regional Advisory
Chairs. Don Hernandez.

OPERATOR: And, excuse me, Greg has joined.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Good morning, Greg.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Good morning, Tom.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, good to have you on.

Della Trumble, are you on.

(No comments)

MR. DOOLITTLE: Nanci Lyon, are you on.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yeah, I'm on.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Hi, Nanci, good morning.

Yukon Kuskokwim Delta, Alissa Rogers, are you on.

(No comments)

MR. DOOLITTLE: I heard some rumblings but no voice.

Jack Reakoff, are you on.

MR. REAKOFF: Yes, I am, good morning.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Hey, good morning, Jack. It looks like your river's going out.

MR. REAKOFF: The river came -- the side streams started coming in. Now, it's 14 degrees, it was barely above freezing yesterday so everything is starting to freeze back up.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, a little reprieve.

MR. REAKOFF: Yeah, it's good to slow it down.
MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, no kidding.

MR. REAKOFF: A lot of the first water that comes down, it goes into the water table, it's got about 600 feet of gravel and it pours into the ground.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, at least you want something to soak in.

MR. REAKOFF: Yeah. Well, we have well here, I can tell the table because my pumps aren't working as hard.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Well, we could just hope that it won't be a bad flood year.

MR. REAKOFF: There's a lot of snow in the Yukon basin, there's a lot of snow at the border, which is more unusual.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Well, we'll see. I'll go down my list here. Have a good morning, Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: Good morning. I'll be on the call.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Louis Green.

(No comments)

MR. DOOLITTLE: Mike Kramer.

(No comments)

MR. DOOLITTLE: No Mike. Sue Entsminger.

(No comments)

MR. DOOLITTLE: And last but not least, Gordon Brower.

(No comments)

MR. DOOLITTLE: Ken Lord, are you on.

MR. LORD: Here, yes, Sir.

MR. DOOLITTLE: All right. Good to
hear you this morning, Ken.

I'll go back to our Board members, Chad Padgett, are you on?

(No comments)

MR. DOOLITTLE: Could we have Staff email Chad and see if he needs assistance this morning.

(No comments)

(Pause)

MR. DOOLITTLE: We'll give a few minutes for Mr. Padgett to get on. But barring that we do have a quorum of the Board, which at the discretion of the Chair, would mean that we could do the public comment period, non-agenda item opportunity that we have for the beginning of the day, Tony.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Excuse me, Tom, what was that?

MR. DOOLITTLE: It's that if you decide -- we do have a quorum of the Board, if you decide that you'll wait for Chad and Charlie to chime in, as we get towards the proposals, we do have the public comment period, non-agenda items as the first order of business this morning as an opportunity that we provide at the beginning of each day.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes. That's where we'll start off this morning and thank you for that. We'll give them two more minutes, Tom, we'll start at 10 after.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So the people on line, if they're on as well, and they're having trouble, just make sure that the public as well as an opportunity as well to get on. So 10 after start, two minutes.

MR. PADGETT: Hi Tony. Hi Tom. This is Chad, I'm sorry I was having trouble getting in but I'm on now.
MR. DOOLITTLE: Good to hear your voice, Chad. Good morning.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: There we go.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Right on. Good morning, everybody. The third day of our Federal Subsistence Board meeting here and welcome everybody back in and glad we're having a little easier time signing on this morning. Good job yesterday to Staff and everybody making it through the portions that we have made it through, we're clipping along pretty decent.

This morning we start off, like Tom stated, the meeting with the public comment period on non-agenda items. So this is an opportunity that is available at the beginning of each day for the public to speak on non-agenda items directly with the Board. And so with that I will open up the floor. Operator, if there's anybody available please make their lines open and they can speak to the Board.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: This is, Tom, too, Mr. Chair, if I may.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Tom, go ahead, you have the floor.

MR. DOOLITTLE: I just want to remind the public that to hit star one to get into that cue and take your phone off of mute and that we're looking at about, to be respectful of each other on the phone lines, about 10 minutes to speak.

Also if people want to know where we're at in the agenda, you can call Tom Kron directly at OSM at 1-800-478-1456, or 907-786-3888, or you can contact and find out where we are on the agenda by getting on line at www.doi.gov/subsistence/board, or on our Facebook page at Facebook.com/subsistencealaska. And I just wanted to make sure folks knew to hit star one if they need to get into the cue and then the operator can introduce them to the Board.
Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, Greg Siekaniec.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Greg, you have the floor.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Hey, Tom. I'm hearing from Carol that she's not in the conference at this point in time, have we not opened all the lines?

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, the way that she can get into the conference to speak is by just punching star one, and if she's having....

MR. SIEKANIEC: Yeah, she's not hearing any of the information, any of your introductory remarks or anything.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Oh.

MS. WORKER: Tom, it's Suzanne. I'm getting the same message from OSM Staff, from several of them.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay. Operator, could we please address that on why -- I would presume that people may just be hearing elevator muzak instead of hearing the meeting, could we address that please.

OPERATOR: Yes, they are hearing the meeting now.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Greg, for that. We'll give another minute or two here for the people to chime in.

(Pause)

MR. PADGETT: Mr. Chair, this is Chad with BLM. Could I have the floor for a moment?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You bet, Chad, go ahead.

MR. PADGETT: Thank you. So I just
wanted to provide you some updates. I failed at the
beginning when we went through agency updates, I failed
to mention something that's fairly important. As some
of you may know Casey Burns from BLM has been standing
in for us as our subsistence coordinator since the
retirement of Dan Sharp, and so Casey's done an
excellent job of coming up to speed as quickly as
possible as well as getting me up to speed for the
meeting so I wanted to recognize him and his efforts,
number 1, because he's done a great job with it.
Especially not having much exposure. So first thanks
to him.

Secondary. We are close to making a
selection for our coordinator position, so I thought
that was also important to mention. And once we do
that we'll make all the necessary and appropriate
announcements.

And then finally, today, I apologize to
everybody, I have to go off line about 11:00 o'clock to
handle a couple other briefings and meetings and be
back on, hopefully after the lunch break. So Casey
will be handling the meetings for me during that
interim period.

So I just want to let you all know that
and sorry to take so much time.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
Chad. And Tom, did the operator state that the lines
were open now?

MS. WORKER: Tom, I'm getting
confirmation from Staff that all is well.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. Now, I
do n't hear Tom.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Now, you'll hear, it
was my mute button.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, now
we'll get the meeting started, I think we've got everybody on. And the public, I just received a text, one public member wants to speak this morning and he's not able to so if you could open up Lee Wallace's line, he wants to do public testimony this morning, Operator, Mr. Lee Wallace.

OPERATOR: His line is open.

MR. WALLACE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And thank you, FSB Board members, and RAC Chairmen. I just want to make a few comments on non-agenda items.

I was on Monday and Tuesday and somehow I didn't get to be able to chime in on Tuesday with all the dropped lines and what not.

So anyway, clearly we're all experiencing an unprecedented event here with Covid-19. the State of Alaska is experiencing a damaged food supply chain. A quick example, on Good Friday, the tribe distributed Easter Food baskets to our 65 Seniors and placing an order through Safeway, they stated they ordered from the Lower 48 and currently back then they were receiving two percent of their order, and so obviously they didn't fill our order, a 90 percent unmet need. Definitely a food security issue for Alaska and especially rural areas.

OVS supports the FSA20-01, 02, and 03 for the Kuskokwim area. Definitely it will reduce the pool of harvesters and we believe that harvesting priority to the rural subsistence harvesters. We're really in very abnormal times and it'll be some time before we get back to normal times, maybe as late as 2021.

I'm going to make quick comment on the Roadless Rule. I thank Don Hernandez for bringing it up on Monday. In March we were to have a government to government consultation with Hubbard and, of course, that got delayed because of Covid-19 and in the afternoon received an email from Hubbard stating he's going to have a tribal consultation on April 28th with the Southeast tribes telephonically. Clearly not the best as a face to face consultation. I think Tony was in the November consultation, and definitely face to face is always better and, of course, all the Board members, I've heard a number of you saying that face to
face is much better, but we have to deal with what we
have to deal with in today's times.

On Monday OVS submitted a SAR, and also
on Monday I heard a number of people talking about SARs
and I think you're going to receive a number of SARs in
the near future with our current situation. And I want
to say that when I was looking at the FSB site, it is
quite easy to navigate and pull up the instructions on
how to submit a SAR, and immediately after that I went
to State of Alaska site and that was really just
daunting and there's nothing -- no comparison to what
the FSB site had and so, with a number of emails and
what not, I was able to get word that I need to make a
request to Commissioner, of Fish and Game, to the State
and I'll be doing that also to supplement our Federal
request.

I just want to thank the Board and the
RACs for all the work they do, you guys do a wonderful
job and you guys are tasked to do a very important task
for rural subsistence users and harvesters.

Thank you.

That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Mr.
Wallace. Appreciate you calling in today and speaking
on these topics. Any questions or discussions for Mr.
Wallace.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
thank you, again, Mr. Wallace, for calling in and
speaking to those non-agenda items, those are important
topics we've heard over the last couple of days and
definitely trying to get some energy behind some of
those topics, so, thank you.

Operator, is there any other public on
line that would like to speak on non-agenda items?

OPERATOR: At this point if anybody on
the line wants to speak, please press star one at this
time. And our first question is Greg Risdahl, your
line is open.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor.

OPERATOR: And, again, Greg Risdahl, your line is open.

MR. RISDAHL: Ma'am, I do not have a question. I was calling because I was hearing the elevator muzak earlier.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. Thank you, Greg, appreciate you calling in.

OPERATOR: And our next one is from Joel Jackson, your line is open.

MR. JACKSON: Good morning. I just wanted to make a comment and I heard that the SAR may be considered during this meeting and I was just calling in to encourage that it be added to the agenda. And it's important, I feel, that we have something in place. You know, you look at the news and the meat plants and chicken plants are being shut down because of the Covid-19 virus. So I got to provide for our community as being the tribal leader. I have to be able to have something in place in case everything just gets shut down. We need to have the food security for our tribal citizens so I'm encouraging you to consider putting this on your agenda today and hopefully get to it on your last day, which I believe is Thursday.

So thanks again and you guys are doing a great job. I know there's a lot of pressure on you guys and I appreciate your time and efforts and hopefully you all stay safe.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Joel, for calling in, appreciate the comments. Any questions for Joel.

(No comments)

OPERATOR: Our next question is from Ben Stevens, your line is open.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Ben, you have

the floor.

(No comments)

OPERATOR: And, again, Ben Stevens,
we're not able to hear you, please check your mute
button.

MR. STEVENS: Can you hear me now?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Loud and clear,
Ben, you're on.

MR. STEVENS: I'm so sorry, I knew
better and in my mind I tracked it through and when it
came time I just panicked and I apologize.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, members of the
Board. I really do appreciate you guys taking the time
to hear from the people out there in the state on items
that are not so strictly bound to an agenda. What I
wanted to mention is that we out here in the listening
audience really do appreciate you guys broaching the
subject of food security as you did last evening, or
yesterday afternoon, a whole bunch of us were out here
hoping that you guys were going to take up these SARs,
these special action requests that are floating around
out there. This is a major, major concern to our
people out there on the ground because they don't have
the Safeway, they don't have the Fred Meyers. A lot of
them have a one room store that shelves go bare on a
routine basis. Add to it this pandemic situation and
it gets even worse. In fact, we've had entire airlines
go bankrupt and are no longer even flying to the
villages and that compounds the problem, the food
insecurity out there. So I'm really, really glad and
I'm encouraged that you guys are taking up the hard
tow.

We did approach the State, Alaska
Department of Fish and Game with our concerns, I mean
our -- the Tanana Chiefs Conference submitted a request
to them to allow some additional hunting opportunity
and what we got back was a blatant no. One of the
concerns was that they were worried about future
harvests of the various hunts out there. And I thought
to myself, okay, this is really, really messed up,
because we have lost perspective. At one time our
people out there in Stevens Village on the Yukon used
to be able to hunt all year long to feed their
families, to put something in that soup pot. They
didn't thrash the resources or totally annihilate
species, they just got what they needed to feed the
family and they did that all year long. Springtime it
was birds, so forth. Now, we find ourselves looking at
the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and they say,
okay, well, you have two weeks, not all year, you have
two weeks to go get your animal and if you don't, so
what. Now, put yourself in that situation, you got two
weeks to go to the store, for the rest of the year, and
your shelves go absolutely bare, and there's no relief.
And so that's what we're looking at Mr. Chairman and
members of the Board, we are appealing to you to offer
-- to provide us with some type of opportunity to feed
our families. Hopefully, one of these days, all of you
will be able to experience some of the things that
we're dealing with right now. Those folks out there in
Holy Cross. Those folks out there in Koyukuk. All the
way up the river to the people in Stevens Village,
where I'm from, Ft. Yukon. In order to make hard core
decisions like this with confidence, it's imperative
that you come out and visit us in fish camp.

And so I would encourage that, but I
also want to get back and say thank you very kindly for
broaching the subject, Mr. Chairman and members of the
Board, that are willing to take on this daunting task
of helping us put something in the soup pot. And so I
look forward to hearing that and we will be listening
in.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Ben.
 Appreciate you calling in today and sharing the
concerns of rural residents. Any questions for Ben.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
 appreciate you taking the time today to call in, Ben.
Any other public on line, Operator, that wish to speak
this morning on non-agenda items?

OPERATOR: Yes, we have several. Cody
Larson, your line is open.
MR. LARSON: Good morning, thank you, Mr. Chairman and to the Board members, as public servants here, for your service. For the record my name is Cody Larson and I'd like to bring one point of concern to the attention of the Board today.

This concern is in relation to what could be considered other matters related to the taking of fish and wildlife. In this case, access to fish and wildlife on public lands is a concern. During previous regional RAC meetings, public concerns are voiced over a development activity around the Pebble mineral deposit and the potential for adverse impacts on Federally-qualified subsistence users.

So it's a large project but to date there's not been a Title VIII, Section .810 of ANILCA analysis of those potential impacts on Federally-qualified subsistence users. I'd like to point out that in each of the development scenarios reviewed during the draft EIS, the plans including a private road, slurry and natural gas pipeline over the BLM managed ANCSA 17(b) easements, so those are the easements for access for qualified subsistence users, and for public to access Federal public lands, the Federal interest in these lands is in providing access for hunting and fishing and it's not what's considered simple fee, or fee ownership interest, however, there is a provision afforded to the Board to specifically request a review of the potential impacts to Federally-qualified subsistence users in the form of that Title VIII, Section .810 analysis of that project.

So my request is in the annual report to the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture that the Board use the powers and the duties under a regulation 36 CFR 242.10, subsection 4, sub X -- 19, and that the powers and duties afforded with your appointment allow for recommending the inclusion of those BLM managed access, the public land interests, within the Federal Subsistence Management Program, and I think that access to these lands is as important as, you know, the regulations around fish and wildlife. So in this specific instance, I believe that this analysis of potential impacts on subsistence users and resources, it would result in a supplemental EIS, it's fully required to execute implementation of Title VIII on behalf of Alaska subsistence users in a region.
And that's the one point of concern I'd like to bring to your attention, those comments are in the transcripts at the RAC meetings, and I'd just request that the Board take action on that analysis, that could -- you know, have the potential -- it's just a review of what those impacts could be, so we're fully aware as subsistence users, what those impacts may be.

Again, I thank you for your service to the public, Mr. Chairman, and the members of the Board. Feel free to contact me with any questions that you may have. I thank you again.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, I appreciate you calling in this morning and thank you for that insight. Any questions from the Board.

MR. PADGETT: Mr. Chair, Chad Padgett.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Chad, go ahead.

MR. PADGETT: Hi, this is Chad Padgett with BLM. Thank you for your comment. The Donlin actions were a little bit before my tenure here but I am checking on an answer for you as far as the .810, in fact, I just got a text as I've been talking here and there was an .810 done on the BLM analysis, it's an attachment to the Record of Decision. I'd be happy to get that to you if you'd like to see it.

MR. LARSON: Through the Chair. Mr. Padgett. Appreciate that, I do know that the Donlin Mine, which is close in vicinity to this other development has done an .810 analysis, and most large developments do, I'm referring to another project or deposit in the region which is called the Pebble deposit.

Thank you.

MR. PADGETT: My apologies, thank you. Sorry.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Operator.

OPERATOR: And our next question is from Arnold Demoski, your line is open.
MR. DEMOSKI: Yes, good morning. Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, I hear you good Arnold, you have the floor.

MR. DEMOSKI: Okay. I just want to address two specific proposals that are not on the non-consensus agenda, on the WP20-36 and WP20-37. I want to support WP20-36, that's, I believe, putting the winter hunt back on for us on the Federal lands during March. I'm aware of all the moose trend counts and I get the report every year and for the past decade I've seen the numbers double in size in our area, and a lot of that is because we have really great hunters in our area in Nulato and Kaltag and they're really great at taking a lot of wolves out of the area and we have a lot of good bear hunters too that take a lot of grizzlies so that's the reason why the moose population doubled. But I supported those, they're very good times for our people especially out in Nulato and Kaltag to hunt, it's -- that hunt is right before our ceremony of StickDance celebration. It's the week before, or maybe two weeks before, so having a hunt there is really good for us. Our population in the village is pretty much double, sometimes tripled in size so having that extra opportunity there for us to harvest moose meat to feed the whole town and our visitors is really good.

I know we're not meeting our harvest quota every year anyways so having that extra opportunity is good.

Also I want to say for WP20-37, I think that to put the December hunt on the books, on the regulations and I just think that having that there at this time is not good. I believe if we do meet our harvest quota for the winter hunt, if we do meet it in December then we wouldn't have that opportunity to hunt in March so I just feel like it's not good to have it there at this time.

That's all I wanted to address and thank you for allowing us to speak on non-agenda items this morning. I've been on since Monday, too, and listening in every day and you guys are doing a really good job.
Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Board members.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for that comment, appreciate you calling in and sharing that with us. It's always good to hear positive feedback. Any questions from the Board.

MS. MAAS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

MS. MAAS: This is Lisa. And I just wanted to tell the person who just commented, that that -- those proposals will be considered later on in the agenda, so he's welcome to comment on those proposals when they're considered individually during the public comment period.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for that. Any other people on line who wish to speak on non-agenda items.

OPERATOR: Our next comment is from Gayla Hoseth, your line is open.

MS. HOSETH: Good morning, and thank you and good morning, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. For the record, Gayla Hoseth, I'm with Curyung Tribal Council here in Dillingham, Alaska, and I'm also the Director of Natural Resources for Bristol Bay Native Association.

I wanted to bring up the Pebble discussion again, and thank you to Cody Larson for putting it on the table this morning as well. We attended the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council meeting last October and brought this to the attention of the RAC of the -- for the draft environmental impact statement comments and we were thankful that the Department of Interior submitted comments stating that, you know, a revised or supplemental EIS needs to be done due to data gaps identified in the document and the Department with multiple cooperating agencies. I just wanted to extend a big thank you to the agencies that did provide comments for the EIS. And as we go through this process, it's really important that -- you know, this is supposed to be in the RAC's annual report to the Federal Subsistence Board, that the RAC is in
support of the Department of Interior's comments and we wanted to bring it up to the Federal Subsistence Board level to also bring that to the Department of Interior for support for a supplement or a revised EIS. And so that's something that we've been requesting a year ago, we went through the RAC and now we're here, again, at the Federal Subsistence Board and I just also echo what Cody Larson stated, that we do need to have a Section .810 analysis in the Bristol Bay region for the Pebble Mine deposit.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Gayla, for calling in today, appreciate that. Any comments from the Board for Gayla.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, hearing none, thank you. Operator, I'll ask again if there's any other person on line that would like to speak to non-agenda items, this is the opportunity.

MR. C. BROWER: Mr. Chair, for the record.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, welcome back Charlie.

MR. C. BROWER: Thank you. I'm here.

OPERATOR: And our next question is from Elizabeth Crow, your line is open.

MS. CROW: Hello, can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We can hear you Elizabeth, you have the floor.

MS. MEDICINE CROW: Gunalcheesh, Howaa. My name is Elizabeth Medicine Crow, my last name is Medicine Crow and it's two separate words but it's my last name, so just clarifying that for the record.

I'm calling on behalf of First Alaskans Institute. I am the President CEO of our organization. And we have been watching what has been happening across our state, first this pandemic hit, I want to
appreciate and acknowledge the hard work of our tribes and our local governments to take care of our communities like they always have, putting in place travel bans and shelter in place mandates, even before most of the cities and the State of Alaska did. I think that speaks to their commitment and their dedication and their real awareness of how these things will impact and are impacting very small communities across Alaska.

I'm calling in to support our villages because of that and our tribes as they try to address this pandemic and the very real food insecurity issues that is causing.

As you know we've already had these issues with the food supply chain coming into village Alaska from the Lower 48. It's no secret that Alaska has a dependency on outside food sources and it has contributed, quite frankly, to a lot of problems here in the state, especially with our own health. But now even more so, as Lee Wallace spoke to earlier on the call, even those lines are even further restricted, so imagine getting two percent of the Safeway shipment from down south into Ketchikan and that two percent having to feed Ketchikan plus the outlying communities that rely on the freight service into those communities, all of those systems are under increased and compressed pressure because of this. I think it's really important to note that and I appreciate this body for taking these things into consideration because these are real.

I'm also calling in to support the tribal special action request that have been put forward and also those that have not come forward yet. I think because so many of our communities are scrambling to care for the basic health needs and make sure everyone's set up, scrambling at the same time to deal with the Federal relief packages and find our way through that maze of bureaucracy and administrative challenges, that not all of our tribes and our communities are able to do everything. And so I wanted to make sure to highlight that, that I'm calling in to support the ones that have been submitted as well as knowing that across our state so many people are concerned about their ability to hunt and fish during this time.
I also want to recognize the urgent need that this pandemic is highlighting, which is the need for government to government compacting, to be able to meaningfully address this moment, certainly, but also moving forward. There are very real impacts and dangers that the food supply chain, as was noted earlier by Joel Jackson, for those foods that might come up from down South. Also it's really important to note that the healthiest that we can be is when we're out on our lands harvesting our own foods, eating our own foods, processing our own foods, that takes a lot of effort, a lot of activity, a lot of time, and it does cost a lot of money as well, but it's an investment in our health and our wellbeing and the best people to manage that are the people here in the communities and reduce any outside flow of folks coming in and out of our communities and we can do that by utilizing that government to government relationship between the Federal government and the tribes of Alaska. And to that point I also urge you to consider the delegation of Federal authority to the tribes to manage hunting and fishing, especially right now to proactively address the Covid-19 concerns and, again, limit the exposure to people coming in and out and also providing the commensurate resources to do it. I think it's an opportune moment to think about how this has already been successfully done both through the Indian Health Service and also through the Bureau of Indian Affairs. This is a process that already exists and could be easily activated to support these urgent food security issues in our villages across the state.

Thank you, so much.

Gunalcheesh. Howaa for your time and consideration.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for taking the time to call in today Elizabeth. Appreciate the good comments that you had. Any questions from the Board to Elizabeth.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, Howaa, thank you for calling in today.

Operator, at this time I would ask if there is anybody else on line that would like to speak
to a non-agenda item, now is the time.

OPERATOR: And our next question or comment is from Della Chaney, your line is open.

MS. CHANEY: Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, I can hear you Della.

MS. CHANEY: My name is Della Chaney, and my Tlingit name is (In Tlingit) and my Haida name is (In Haida). And I'm calling in support of the tribal special action requests. I'm an elder and I am concerned for my grandchildren, my great grandchildren and my great, great. I know they are being affected by everything that is going on through the school system, through the city, the State and the Federal government, and they're having to do a lot of learning to make them participate in what is going on right now to finish their school out. So I'm really concerned about the food line that's coming into our villages, so if there's anything you can do I would really appreciate it. I do appreciate the work that you folks are doing.

Howaa, Gunalcheesh for letting me share that.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for taking the time to call in today, Della, appreciate hearing from you. Any questions from the Board for Della.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, hearing none, Operator, is there anybody else on line who would like to speak to non-agenda items.

OPERATOR: Yes, we have several more. Our next question or comment is from Brooke Wood, your line is open.

MS. WOOD: Good morning, can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have the floor.
MS. WOOD: Hi, good morning. My name is Brook Wood, and I work for Tanana Chiefs Hunting and Fishing Task Force. One of our main missions is direct advocacy to protect Alaska Native hunting and fishing rights which is central to our traditional ways of life and wellbeing.

I wanted to express how exhausting it has been for our program when tribes are asking for help and we are trying to use the systems that are in place and being denied. And what a heartbreak and hardship that is for a tribe to request from the State emergency hunts during an emergency situation and be denied. So the SAR process right now is essential and extremely important for rural communities.

And I just wanted to make a few comments on the response that Tanana Chiefs received from Fish and Game Commissioner Doug Vincent-Lang, and the State's approach to addressing the needs of rural communities for an out of season take of game as food source during the Covid situation.

At this time each day brings a new challenge and currently communities are being told that it is an above average possibility for flooding, so two weeks of waiting is unacceptable. I encourage the Federal Subsistence Board SARs process be streamlined and equitable among communities and consider what delegation of authority will have on communities beforehand if there are any concerns from communities, please address them immediately with each SAR.

It is well known that fish and wildlife harvest for food provides a major part of nutritional requirement of Alaska's rural population and less notable percentage is from urban areas. The annual take of animals in the annual rural harvest is 276 pounds per person. And it has been well documented that Alaska subsistence hunters, fishers and gathers harvest in traditional use areas surrounding their communities.

Another consideration that needs to be brought forward is what are the effects of the environmental changes with the warming climate on harvesting and the challenges that brings forward and are those hunting grounds accessible at this time.
I also wanted to state that Alaska faces unique food security challenges just because of the remoteness and cost of transportation and the cost of living.

So while food harvested from the land provide the most food security for our people, and we are well when we are harvesting and when we are fishing, and these foods are the most healthiest food available for our people. And I want Board members and agencies to think about what would it be like for you if you were assigned to a small rural community right now. There's no running water, which is typical in communities like mine. There is no store. No wifi or cell service. Utilities like electricity and fuel are high. Those are your main expenses. Will you get a motorized vehicle there. What is the cost to get that vehicle there. What food supplies are you going to bring. How are you going to purchase that while you are in isolation. Do you have the luxury of cell service and a shopping app that will bring that food directly to your door. How much store bought protein can you purchase. Will you leave it freshly butchered and packed the way it is or will you split that package so it goes further and will you freeze it so you know that it'll make it to your community. Which airlines will you use because some airlines are no longer operating. And there's no guarantee that your food will make it with you. How long will that food supply last you. Are you going to share some of that food to single parents or elders. Once your food supply runs out will you purchase food. Are you on the road system. Can you reach your home only by air. Do you have a family member willing to risk being exposed to Covid-19 to shop for you, to bring your boxes to the airlines. And will your food arrive in time to where it's edible.

These are things that I face as a parent living in rural Alaska and these are just things that you need to consider when you're making decisions for rural residents.

And that doesn't even account for how much it costs to get your food to get to a community.

The Commissioner mentioned that food supplies can be sent by Unified Command, and if that is the case it needs to happen now because NOAA is
encouraging communities to prepare for flooding and to be staged, and to be staged you need all the food now. And if you can't provide that food now, then the community needs to do that with an emergency hunt availability.

So even though there are airlines going in and out of the communities, that does not mean that you have food security.

He also states that there is existing hunting opportunities such as migratory birds and black bears as food source, and as an Alaska Native woman I'm not supposed to say black bears but I have to break protocol in this Western system. There is one community that depends greatly on migratory birds, but because of the changing climate they are no longer able to go out and harvest birds because there is no access because of the rapid change in weather. And the big animal is a delicacy among men, and women who no longer are of child bearing age, so that food source is not available for every single person in every single community. And water fowl is also a delicacy that, you know, we value and appreciate but it could only go so far for -- and it is not the main protein of our people such as moose. And some of the opportunities that he mentioned in his letter were not for every single person in the amount of time that we had to wait, some of those hunt opportunities were closed.

I'm almost done.

In closing, no request that you get from an Alaska Native community or person will take more than is needed and that hunt will be shared amongst family and community. We are taught to respect land, animal and people, and have stewarded since time immemorial. We do our due diligence, we enact policy and regulation while trying to keep our traditional ways of life alive and well. And I feel like we're still in survival mode as Native people, Covid-19 has revealed the inequities faced in a broken system, and in the end, since 1968 Congress has recognized that tribal governments with inherent sovereignty are the entities best suited to meet the needs of their community because they are more directly accountable to the people they represent, more aware of the community issues that are faced daily and more agile to responding to changing circumstances.
And that is my public testimony for you today.

Thank you so much.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for taking the time today to call in. Appreciate you putting it in perspective for us here on the Board about the issues that rural Alaskans are facing so appreciate it. Does the Board have any questions or comments.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, hearing none. Thank you for calling in. Operator, I will ask if there is any other public on line that would like to speak to the non agenda items, this is their opportunity.

OPERATOR: The next question or comment is from Leo Lomitz, your line is open.

LEO: Hey, good morning, could you hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hear you loud and clear, Leo.

LEO: Good morning. This is Leo Lomitz, thank you for this opportunity, Mr. Chairman and the Board, to make my commentary. You know we're in dire need at this time and here in the community of Koyukuk on the Middle Yukon, Koyukuk River for this special action request on the special moose hunt due to the denial that we received from the State, that wasn't very -- it wasn't very good on us, we didn't sit on that too kindly, but it is what it is. So therefore we have to approach the Federal Subsistence Board to make our request. But, anyhow, because at the same time during this pandemic, Covid-19, we're also preparing for a possible flood here in the community in the Middle Yukon, all up and down the Yukon and Koyukuk River. And there's also in a time and need where we can store some food in case we get caught from high water and flooding. Sometimes when you get caught in that kind of situation it's up to a two weeks, or a week, or even longer, you get caught in the situation and you're bound to where you're at in your boat or in
-- on high land. So we got to have this food because it's needed.

It's been -- you know we don't have these great supermarkets like you all do have in the urban areas where you can run out and get your meat or your groceries, you know, every day, our food source is out there in our backyard, that's our supermarket. That's the only place we can obtain it from. And at this time, you know, it's really hard and right now we're facing spring break up weather in the community of Koyukuk -- I'm also the First Chief, by the way I didn't acknowledge that earlier, of the Koyukuk Tribe, we had a tremendous rain spell there for about a week and we only have maybe a week or a little longer to do our moose hunt because of the conditions. The river will get in after this, and the lakes and what not. It's the only time we have accessible for traveling. So, you know, it's time that we got to get this -- we're doing this for the overall community, for the unwed mothers with children and the elderly and also the handicaps, those are people that can't go out for themselves so, therefore, we have to, as a tribe, have to go out and do this for them and for the entire community, all we're requesting is at least three to four moose and given time we're requesting up to 60 days if that's possible, however long this Covid-19 lasts, we don't know how long it'll last ourselves, you know, until we get on the other side. And the cost of transportation for shipping our food out is a dollar a pound and if you bring it out yourself then it's $2 a pound so that's a tremendous amount of stress on one person. If you buy your food in the city and you're -- right now we're on a lock down basis so we got no traveling between communities or into the urban areas and this is really an essential need, you know, it's health related, it's the only time we can travel right now, but other than that we're stuck in the community. We're abiding by the mandate that's set upon us, which is good, to help along with the Covid-19, to try to reach the other side.

I was very disappointed of the State denying us for a special hunt, that wasn't very, very nice of them, although we've been trained like this by our ancestors for many years and our subsistence lifestyle, we only take what we need, we don't abuse the system, we don't abuse the animals or the waterfowl or what not. We take what we need and that is it, we
use every part of the moose, or the animals that we take or the birds that we take. We don't waste nothing. We just conserve and respect the land. We're very, very traditional and well taught people by our scientific ancestors who drove this into our minds many, many long years for tens and thousands of years. So therefore we respect the land and we take care of it and we only take what we need.

Along with this we're at the time of break up and a possible flood and all along the middle Yukon and even up the Koyukuk River is in danger of flooding due to a lot of snow we got throughout the winter, and the ice thickness, and run off from the hills land we know it's going to be high water, but at the present time we're also preparing for a flood and this Covid-19 shelter in place, it's really a task on us but yet we still got to feed our people and make sure to get through this.

In closing, you know, Koyukuk is really a -- if you need to hear from us more, we are available. You know, we're on Unit 21B (ph) area (muffled) and there's a lot of Refuge land surrounding us so, you know, with that said I hope you take time and respect our request and think about it long and hard and I hope you come up with a good answer for us, you know.

I'd like to thank you on behalf of my community of Koyukuk, being the First Chief, and thank you, Mr. Chairman and the Board, for giving me this time and opportunity to voice my concerns and my comments.

Thank you.

And God Bless you all.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for taking the time to call in today and God Bless you as well, and you know, the best to you and your community. Any questions from the Board.

MS. PITKA: No question, but thank you, Chief, for calling in. I appreciate hearing your words today.

LEO: Thank you, Ma'am. Appreciate for
the comment there, it's well taken.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Operator, any other public on line that would like to speak at this time to non-agenda items.

OPERATOR: Yes, Sir. The next question or comment is from Mike Jackson, your line is open.

MR. JACKSON: Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and the Board. I'm Mike Jackson, my Tlingit name is (In Tlingit), my Haida name is (In Haida) and part of our tradition here in Kake is supplying foods for the young, the mothers, the children, and the elders.

Today the whole tribe is in a situation where we're calling upon you for this special action requests. And part of that is our customary and traditional gathering that we share and we only take what we really need. Like our President, we have said in the past, but I'll reiterate it now, is that the State Board of Fish and Game has rejected our special action request in regard for moose and deer. And I'd like to remind the Board just because I'm an elder, but as a Staff person for our tribe, through the transportation department, it calls upon us many times in our program, to supply transportation for customary and traditional gatherings.

Part of my comment today is to remind the Board, that the Federal Subsistence Board was created just for this type of situation. And thank God for Katie John, that took on the Federal government to take on the trust responsibility of all our five Federal Board members there, to look and act upon their trust responsibilities for the health and wellness of all tribes in Alaska. And I don't need to remind you all that it is because the State did not, and still does not recognize tribes, that this action of the Federal Subsistence Board was created. And I would really call upon the Federal Subsistence Board to look at the co-management of fish and game, of customary and traditional gathering that the tribes have practiced since time immemorial.

And I'd like to thank all the people that have commented on all the special agenda items, and/or this informal one, and really thank the Federal
Subsistence Board for taking this one, on this time of emergency. Down here in Southeast Alaska we were hit with the lack of ferry service beginning in the fall and it doesn't look it's going to open until mid-summer now, but now with this Covid-19, food services in Seattle that give priority to the large food chains down South and we see the lack of food coming into Juneau and Sitka because of -- they look at Alaska as the state across the water. And, you know, we're lacking of our food, we know that the people that have been marginalized before are much more now, and the food that we are dependent upon isn't there like we can go to the store and pick up anything that we would like, it's not like that here in the rural villages. And we call upon our Fish and Game Board to look at our customary and traditional gathering because it's our sustenance here in the rural area. But you also have heard through the testimony that it is a spiritual, a wellness of our mental health and our health and nutrients. So I think you guys have the ability to do so and I really encourage you to, is to fast-track these permits, and we know that the tribal government can take on the responsibility of doing such things.

These aren't ordinary times.

And you can see it in people, in our own community, of them being worried, and I thank the people that work for the tribes, especially the Tribal Council and Chiefs and their Staff to get out and try to create a better situation in our rural communities.

So, thank you, again, Mr. Chairman, and Board, to look at these subjects very carefully and make sure that the trust responsibility is there for our communities just like the Katie John case decision was made.

Gunalcheesh. Howaa.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Mike. Appreciate you calling in today and giving us the viewpoint from your community. Any questions from the Board for Mike.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Best to you,
Mike.

MR. JACKSON: Howaa.

OPERATOR: And our next question is from Carlos Frank, your line is open.

MR. FRANK: Good morning, Board.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Good morning.

MR. FRANK: I have testimony on Proposal WP20-49, but there is a flood warning here and I'm sorry my attentions are needed elsewhere, and I would like to speak on the proposal now.

(No comments)

MR. FRANK: Would that be fine?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, go ahead.

MR. FRANK: Okay. I'm here testifying in opposition to Proposal WP20-49 to the open -- to open the Arctic Village Sheep Management Area in Unit 25A to the harvest of sheep by non-Federally-qualified users in which the Alaska Department of Fish and Game submitted.

The Alaska Department of Fish and Game state there are no conservation concerns for Federally-qualified subsistence users meeting their needs. My conservation concern is in the form of accessibility and competition to the hunting grounds. Subsistence users are going to try and harvest the game as close to home and using as little money as possible knowing the income, or the bills, and the cost of keeping a roof over his head, as opposed to the non-Federally-qualified users who are, in my belief, the trophy hunters and the hunting guides which are making money off the resources while subsistence users desperately need to carry on their traditional and traditional values -- these trophy hunters and guides have the money to buy hundreds of gallons of gas for their boats and ATVs, or they come in by plane, which there are make-shift landings within the management area, but locate and position themselves in specific hunting areas that the local subsistence hunters work so hard to get to.
And with that that concludes my testimony. I thank you for your time. And pray the considerations of the subsistence users are being thought of while making such vital decisions on these proposals.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for taking the time to call in today, appreciate it. Any questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Could I get your name for the record one more time, please, I missed that.

MR. FRANK: Yes, it's Carl Frank, C-A-R-L, Frank F-R-A-N-K.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right. Thank you for calling in today, Carl, appreciate it.

MR. FRANK: Yep, thank you guys for your time.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right.

OPERATOR: Our next comment is from Bruce Irvin, your line is open.

MR. IRVIN: Good morning, can you guys hear me okay?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I hear you fine, Bruce, you have the floor.

MR. IRVIN: Okay. Thank you, Chairman, members of the Board, and Staff. For the record, my name is Bruce Irvin, and I work for the Tanana Chiefs Conference, in the Hunting Fishing and Gathering Task Force.

Today I'm here because of (In Native), which is true love for our tribes in the TCC region. We work for tribes and we believe in ensuring a healthy strong unified tribe. We have been working with tribes to submit SARs to open hunting for food security.
Tribes have requested technical assistance navigating State and Federal systems because it is overwhelming. Our tribes are exhausting all administrative options during this challenging time. We are currently working with seven tribes, but there are 42 total tribes in the TCC region. The State Commissioner denied TCC's request for an emergency moose hunt. And one reason was that they couldn't limit hunting to only rural, but rural areas are where the problem is taking place. There are other opportunities for subsistence but the suggested Game Management Unit from the Commissioner only supply opportunity for 20 of the 42 total TCC tribes.

This morning we have heard many tribes all over Alaska echoing similar concerns with food security issues. I have been working closely with the TCC tribes who want to submit an SAR, special action request, and there are challenges so I have done as much as I can to empower them, but the Federal Subsistence Board needs to take action now. We need a better system to address this emergency need. We are running out of time to provide food sources for our rural communities. The National Weather Service stated there's an above average chance of flooding on the Yukon and Tanana Rivers, so, again, we need to take action now.

I want to thank you for listening to my testimony.

Chairman, Members of the Board, and Staff, I appreciate all your hard work.

Thank you.

I hope that we come to some agreement.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for taking the time to call in today. Any questions from the Board, comments.

(NO COMMENTS)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right. Appreciate that. Operator, is there anybody else standing by on the non-agenda topic.

OPERATOR: Yes, we have two more. Karen
Linnell, your line is open.

MS. LINNELL: Thank you. Good morning. This is Karen Linnell, with the Ahtna InterTribal Resource Commission.

I just want to speak in support of special action request for the more rural communities out there. As you know, we live on the highway system which has been a blessing and a curse in regards to competition for our food sources. We had one of our elders make a request for one moose per village for our eight tribes and that was denied. And caribou season was still open. And I just wanted to let you all know that the caribou have not crossed yet and the season has been closed for three weeks now. So they haven't come back from across the river in Game Management Unit 11, which has been closed for over three decades, close to four now, because of the Mentasta Caribou Herd.

But I want to speak in support of those communities that aren't connected to the highway, and are having travel issues with lack of ferry system and lack of flights coming in and those kinds of things.

I saw the letter that the Commissioner wrote to TCC when he told them that, well, you have an area open over here that you can still go to hunt in until April 15th or something, and it was so far away from the other communities, that it just wasn't feasible, and it was like in the backyard, and it was something that you could jump in a car and drive over there to be able to hunt, it's just really not realistic and I don't think that they looked at the map and how far dispersed those communities are. So, you know, we -- I believe that those communities should be afforded the opportunity to get some food to supplement what they have. The lack of travel, of even here, we have tribal members that are afraid and actually some of our communities are closed to people who leave and go to where there is the Covid-19, and if you leave the community and you go to Anchorage or Fairbanks to buy groceries you can't come home, and so we've been restricted to staying where there is no flu, this Covid-19, and no virus, and so if, you know, and out here when you pay $18 for a five pound sack of sugar, you know, and then our produce or anything, if you don't eat it that day it's pretty much spoiled the next day, those are concerns for us. But, you know, at
least we have that opportunity to get on the road and
go somewhere where there isn't a virus and we have that
opportunity, especially now that fuel prices are being
reduced here, we don't have to have our fuel barged in.
These other communities had their fuel barged in last
fall so it's still at the higher prices because that's
what they bought it at. So the drop in fuel prices, it
hasn't really affected them yet.

So I just want to speak in support of
their request.

I feel for our neighbors. I feel for
their stress, their worry, their ability to provide for
themselves. Watching friends from Wainwright and other
parts of the state, and their inability to get their
shipments in because the airlines closed, you know,
those kinds of things are difficult to watch, difficult
to watch your friends struggle like that. And being
able to support one another, like we usually do, even
though I, myself, am able to -- I was able to store
enough to get me through and I'm able to share with my
cousins here, even if I wanted to send some to my
friend in Wainwright, I can't, because there's no
shipping going there, you know. It's a sad thing to
watch your friends struggle. And so being able to have
those folks that are in those more remote areas be able
to put food on the tables of their tribal citizens is
important. And as a matter of fact, not just the
tribal citizens, we have non-tribal friends that live
out there and need to be able to have that food. And
so when we're talking about this kind of thing, you
know, you're not just talking about our own people, we
take care of our neighbors, too.

And I just want to commend all the
leadership that's been calling in and speaking to their
concerns and their worry about their tribes and the
ability to sustain themselves. And so I urge the Board
to take some sort of action to help these folks out
before the end of this meeting.

And I just want to thank you again for
your time, and your understanding.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for
calling in today, Karen, appreciate you speaking on the
topic. Any questions for Karen.
(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Again, thank you, appreciate you calling in today. Operator, you said there was one more on line for public comment on non-agenda items.

OPERATOR: Yes. The next one is Courtenay Carty, your line is open.

MS. CARTY: Thank you, Operator. Mr. Chairman. Good morning, members of the Board. I ended the public testimony on non-agenda items last -- yesterday so I guess I'll go again today. I originally star one'd in so that I could maybe follow up on some of the comments I made yesterday in regards to Curyung Tribal Council, which I am the tribal administrator, for the record.

Our request, continued request for a Section .810 analysis, I had provided our Curyung Tribal Council cooperating agency comments to Donald, Orville, Suzanne and Theo, so hopefully those will be disseminated amongst the Board members and Staff, but before I get into that I just need to take a quick moment to thank the Board for providing the forum where we are able to call in and testify without a time limit. I know for some it's very cumbersome to wait in the cue, but it's very important that we're all able to express our concerns and share the observations of what's happening in our communities. And it's hard to not, you know, take that to heart, it's all very strong words that are being said, and I believe it was Ms. Wood, with Tanana Chiefs earlier today, was asking members of the Board who are from the urban areas, and not necessarily well versed in rural life a bunch of questions about food security and costs and shipping, and I just wanted to share a quick sentiment on that.

While I was in the cue waiting to speak I got a call from our air cargo that my meat pack that I ordered is finally here. So thankfully through the gift of sharing we were able to receive caribou this winter from our friends but we did not hunt ourselves. My cousin, Kayden, is my designated hunter and his snowmachine broke before the season closed, and was unable to go out for us, but, thankfully we were able to have meat and my family is fortunate enough to have enough of a cash economy to be able to supplement our
traditional foods and have food security. So two weeks ago I ordered our meat pack from a meat company that I sometimes order from because our stores out here, even though Dillingham is a hub community, and we have regular freight planes every day, our stores are seeing diminished inventory, some regular routine staple items are not even stock, yeast, for example, cooking yeast is in no store, in Dillingham, nor has it been for quite awhile, but -- and so people are sharing yeast, it's really funny, I'll make up a jam jar and give it to some lady so she could make bread, but thankfully we have the internet to be able to now use this modern technology to exercise our traditional and customary ways of harvesting and sharing, but back to the meat back, you know, that was 75 pounds of meat that I purchased for $310 and then spent another, I believe $55 shipping it here because I was able to ship at food rate, which was 50 cents a pound, but that food rate is now over with Ace Air Cargo, which we're still fortunate to have daily service so just about $400 for 75 pounds of meat, which is less than what we would have gotten with just one caribou, and so that's a little bit of perspective, and two weeks to get here and we're in a hub community. So if it had to go to a bush community or a little village community it would take longer and be more expensive.

Okay, with that said, I'm going to take a minute to read a couple of the comments from our cooperating agency comments that were submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers as well as all the other State and Federal cooperating agencies in regards to the Pebble PSEIS is what we call it now, the preliminary final impact statement.

On Page 6 of 17 of our comments in regards to chapter 3.9 subsistence. Inclusion of an ANILCA .810 analysis. Impacts to 17(b) easements. The PSEIS fails to acknowledge that a subsistence impact analysis is legally required pursuant to ANILCA. Section .810 of ANILCA provides in determining whether to withdraw, reserve, lease or otherwise permit the use, occupancy, or disposition of public lands under any provision of law, authorizing such action, the head of the Federal agency having primary jurisdiction over such lands, or his designee, shall evaluate the need of such use. Shall being the key word, not may, shall; this is required by law. Shall evaluate the effect of such use, occupancy or disposition on the subsistence
uses and needs, the availability of other lands for the purposes sought to be achieved, or other alternatives which would reduce or eliminate the use, occupancy or disposition of public lands needed for subsistence purposes.

So the PSEIS goes on to state that an evaluation of subsistence impacts pursuant to .810 is unnecessary because there are no Federal lands in the project area, however, the PSEIS is completely incorrect. All action alternatives implicate impacts to ANCSA 17(b) easements as noted in Chapter 3.2 on the preferred alternative. So Pebble, PLTs preferred alternative would cross three Section 17(b) easements, two are also crossed by alternative one, or three, and one is off of the Iliamna/Newhalen Road, so alternative one would intersect one Section 17(b) easement on the southern shore of Iliamna Lake and alternative two or three would intersect two Section 17(b) easements both beginning at the northern shore of Iliamna Lake and continuing north. ANCSA Section 17(b) easements are public lands reserved by the U.S. for access to public land and water on lands that have been or will be conveyed, ANCSA Section 17(b) easements provide access to subsistence opportunities on publicly owned land and as such are subject to ANILCA's Section .810.

So our tribal council's recommendation to the Army Corps, Pebble and the cooperating agencies, recommendation; to reiterate our request to the Federal government to evaluate the subsistence impacts of the proposed alternatives under ANILCA Section .810. The Corps must not proceed to a final environmental impact statement until an ANILCA .810 analysis is complete and the public has had the opportunity to review and comment on the analysis in a revised or supplemental environmental impact statement.

So with that said, I guess, in conclusion, I would really try to encourage or charge the BLM rep, Director Padgett, to look into this and work with our tribe and our partners to not only understand our very valid claim, but assure that the law is followed as laid out in ANILCA, Section .810, and that this project does not proceed without the bare minimum, which is required, to disclose under NEPA, which includes a Section .810 analysis on the proposed impacts to subsistence resources in Bristol Bay.
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Courtenay. Thank you for calling in today. Any questions or comments from the Board for Courtenay.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, good to hear you Courtenay, and, again, thank you for calling in today and giving us your perspective on that.

Operator, is there anybody else on line for non-agenda items.

OPERATOR: Yes, one more came through from Gayla Hoseth, your line is open.

MS. HOSETH: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the Board. I just wanted to thank Courtenay Carty, our tribal administrator for bringing this to your guys' attention. And I guess the request would be, is there any way that the Federal Subsistence Board could take action for a Section .810 analysis to be done. This was also brought to the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council and this is supposed to be in the RAC's annual report, also supporting for a Section .810 analysis from the RAC. So time is of the essence. Like I stated earlier, we were here a year ago and if we could have an action item for a Section .810, according to all what Courtenay just read to you, for our comments, as a cooperating agency, would be greatly appreciated.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Gayla. Any discussion from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Appreciate you bringing up that and hopefully we can get an answer back.

Operator, is there anybody else on line who would like to speak on non-agenda items.
OPERATOR: No additional parties in cue at this time.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. Well, I appreciate everybody who called in this morning and speaking for your constituents and people on important issues not related to the agenda.

Thank you, it was a very good informative morning and a good way to start our meeting, so appreciate everybody taking an interest in the program and speaking on behalf of the people you represent and trying to find solutions for the hard times that we find ourselves facing, and unprecedented territory as far as where we are in today’s age.

So, thank you, everybody for doing that, appreciate the patience.

Now, it looks like we move back on to the order of business for this morning and start in with the proposals. Tom, I believe we left on on......

MR. DOOLITTLE: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

MR. DOOLITTLE: And if I may.....

MR. C. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead, Charlie. Hold on one second, Tom.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay.

MR. C. BROWER: This is.....

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Charlie, you have the floor.

MR. DOOLITTLE: This is WP20-27 would be the next on the agenda, if the Board recalls, that we wanted to put WP20-27 in front of WP20-26, so that would be the next order of business.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MS. LAVINE: Good morning, Mr. Chair.
This is Robbin, can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I can hear you Robbin, you have the floor.

MS. LAVINE: So actually, I'm going to revert to 20-26 if you don't mind, is there any -- is there any desire to keep 27 first?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I don't remember.....

MR. DOOLITTLE: That was the direction of the Board Robbin.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I know the Board had a discussion on it the other day so I would, again, ask the Board members to speak up on that.

MS. LAVINE: Uhm.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Yeah, Mr. Chair, this is Greg.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, Greg, go ahead.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Yeah, thank you. Yeah, I had made a motion for an agenda change that would move 20-27 ahead of 20-26 primarily because I think this discussion might inform some of the 20-26 discussion.

MS. LAVINE: Uhm.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you.

MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Through the Chair and thank you, Mr. Siekaniec. I will address 27 first.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: The floor is yours.

MS. LAVINE: Okay. All right. So good morning, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. For the record my name is Robbin Lavine. I'm an anthropologist with the Office of Subsistence Management and I will be presenting both Wildlife Proposals 20-26 and 20-27.
Both pertain to the use of snowmachine for subsistence harvest purposes in Southwest Alaska, and both share a regulatory history. There are some differences. So I will address the regulatory history of snow machine use in Southwest Alaska in this presentation and forego it in the next.


Wildlife Proposal 20-27 was submitted by the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council and it requests a unit specific regulation for Unit 17 allowing use of a snow machine to assist in the taking of a caribou and allowing caribou to be shot from a stationary snowmachine using the regulatory language adopted by the Alaska Board of Game in February 2018. And if it would be helpful I can read the proposed regulatory language for you now, and you can also find it on Page 873 of your Board book, and the language states:

In Unit 17, a snowmachine may be used to assist in the taking of a caribou and caribou may be shot from a stationary snowmachine. Assist in the taking of a caribou means a snowmachine may be used to approach within 300 yards of a caribou at speeds under 15 miles per hour in a manner that does not involve repeated approaches or that causes a caribou to run. A snowmachine may not be used to contact an animal or to pursue a fleeing caribou.

The proposal was submitted by the Council, the recommendation of a working group consisting of representatives from the public, the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council, the Bristol Bay Native Association, the Togiak National Wildlife Refuge, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, the Office of Subsistence Management and State and Federal law enforcement offices. The proponent states, that keeping State and Federal hunting regulations aligned and simple will be more understandable for all users.

So some regulatory history to keep in mind.

In 2016, Wildlife Proposal 16-48 requested that Federally-qualified subsistence users be allowed to use snowmachines to position caribou, wolf,
or wolverine for harvest in Unit 23. The Board adopted
the proposal with modification to allow this method of
harvest only on those lands managed by the Bureau of
Land Management as the regulatory language for this
agency does not specifically prohibit the use of
snowmachine to position animals for hunting. The Board
also noted this harvest method is allowed on some State
managed lands.

In 2017, Wildlife Proposal 18-24
requested pretty much the same thing as 16-48, that
Federally-qualified subsistence users be allowed to use
a snowmachine to position caribou, wolves and
wolverines for harvest in Unit 17 provided the animals
were not shot from a moving snowmachine.

The same proposal, 148, was submitted
to the Board of Game. During its fall 2017 meeting,
the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council opposed 18-24
noting that definitions for positioning and chase of an
animal are not clearly defined in current regulations.
However, in February 2018, the Alaska Board of Game
adopted Proposal 148 with modification limited to the
taking of caribou only shot from a stationary
snowmachine with further clarification describing
exactly how the snowmachine may be used for assistance,
and that language I just read to you, it is part of
this regulatory proposal.

During the April 2018 Federal
Subsistence Board meeting the Bristol Bay Regional
Advisory Council requested Wildlife Proposal 18-24 be
taken off the consensus agenda and some public
testimony was received in support of it. The Board
deliberated the proposal on record and rejected it,
citing concerns over a lack of clarity and consistency
among existing regulations.

Currently the Nushagak Peninsula
Caribou Herd is at population objectives and the
Mulchatna Caribou Herd is not. Regardless the
regulatory change is not expected to impact caribou
populations in the area. Snowmachines are already
extensively used in Unit 17 to access hunting grounds
and harvest numbers will continue to be managed by
seasons and limits within regulation. Specifically,
the proposed regulation will not alter current
prohibitions for snowmachine use on Federal lands, such
as taking caribou from a moving snowmachine, or using a
snowmachine to pursue, drive, herd or molest wildlife. Instead, the proposed regulation provides specific language describing snowmachine use for the purposes of hunting caribou in Unit 17 while remaining in compliance with existing regulations. It will also align State and Federal regulations on snowmachine use while hunting caribou in Unit 17.

The use of snowmachines for subsistence purposes is a traditional practice in the Bristol Bay area and statewide. Public testimony and discussion at Council and Board meetings affirms the significance of snowmachine use to the subsistence way of life while seeking guidance on issues of compliance. This proposal was agreed upon by a diverse group of stakeholders.

The OSM conclusion is to support Wildlife Proposal 20-27.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm here to take questions if you have any.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Ms. Lavine. Any questions for Staff on that presentation.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for that. We'll move on to summary of public comments, Regional Advisory Council coordinator.

MS. WESSELS: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board. This is Katya Wessels with OSM. And we did not receive any written public comments for Wildlife Proposal 20-27.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Katya. We'll at this time now open the floor to any public testimony.

OPERATOR: And, again, for those on the phone if you would like to make a comment, please press star one. Our first comment comes from Robbin Chaney, your line is open.
MS. CHANEY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My name is Robbin Chaney. I'm from Dillingham and I would like to testify in favor of these proposals.

I have five of my own children, I'm also a foster parent. I have four sons so I don't actually get to do a lot of harvesting myself anymore but I'm in favor of this proposal that would decriminalize a traditional hunting method that my family uses. If you've been out here, our snow conditions vary from year to year, it's been a lot warmer -- it is harder to catch caribou, you never know where they're going to be. They're not like salmon. You know, as long as fish come back, they're going to be in the river and we can reliably harvest them. Caribou travel long distances, we know that the herd is really healthy.

I would also like to contribute testimony on behalf of my son, Tristan Chaney, we're on the same line and he wasn't able to stay on the meeting with me all morning, but his contribution to our testimony is that traditionally we don't chase animals anyway. If you're a hunter and if you've used vehicles to hunt, you know that animals that run a great distance so exhaust themselves are very tough and don't taste as well as animals that haven't gone through the stress of being chased. So the way that they use snowmachines are just as described in the proposal, they use it to position between hunters so that they can safely efficiently and respectfully catch caribou for our family. This spring the caribou is really critical to us for subsistence. School's out, and the kids aren't in school, they're all at home, we were able to harvest fortunately caribou this morning, or this spring, and conditions were pretty rough, and so his other comment, too, is with tundra conditions out here being as they are, often times they're not going at a high rate of speed anyway.

But I thank you for this opportunity to testify and share our local knowledge with you.

Quyana.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for taking the time to call in today, any questions or interaction from the Board.
(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Appreciate you taking the time to call in.

Operator, is there any other public on the phone that would like to speak to this proposal.

OPERATOR: Yes, we have three more. We have Courtenay Carty, your line is open.

MS. CARTY: Thank you, Operator. Mr. Chair, if it pleases the Board I would like to defer until we -- my testimony until we get through our hunting families. I know a few of them have called in all morning and have been patiently waiting to provide testimony on this proposal. I'm not sure, I only hear that there's a couple more in the cue, so maybe some have had to drop off to other commitments, but if I may I would like to wait until they go and then provide the tribe's comments.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: That's fine. Operator -- thank you, Courtenay for that. Could we move on to the next public member on line.

OPERATOR: Yes, Sir. Next one is Nichole Crouse, your line is open.

MS. TINKER: Hi, this is Christine Tinker, Nichole Crouse, we were on the line together. Anyways I am Christine Tinker, mother and wife of a subsistence family out here in Bristol Bay.

I have three grown boys who are fishing, hunting, subsistence gathering for myself, my in-laws, my mother, my aunts, family and friends, elders come first. And so my family goes out and subsistence and gathers year-round.

Caribou hunting was our big blessing this past spring. I say that because we hunted last fall, we hunted moose this winter. We did not catch at all. So when we went out this spring my son, who is 15, was blessed with his caribou and was able to share with 10 different families. That went a long way. Like Courtenay had mentioned, flying in meat gets very expensive for Bristol Bay. Our children only know how to eat the subsistence meat like moose and caribou.
They don't like to go to the store like most and buy T-bone steak or New York, that's not what they're familiar with.

So I also, you know, look at this and support the proposal for snowmachines to take caribou and game for our local subsistence men. As we speak they're out in the waters right now subsisting, like I said, we do it year-round, my family lives 95 percent off the land and caribou and moose contribute to most of our protein.

So that's all I really wanted to say is I support it and I really hope that you guys continue to look into this and hearing our comments, I do appreciate it, and taking the time to listen to us.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

Thank you for calling in today and sharing your experience, appreciate that. Any discussion or question from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have a nice day and best to you and the family out there.

Operator, is there another public member on line.

OPERATOR: Yes, we have three more and our next one is from Heidi Kritz, your line is open.

MS. KRITZ: Good morning, thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. My name is Heidi Kritz. I live in Dillingham currently, I grew up in the subsistence way of life in Aleknagik, and Togiak.

I am not a hunter but I am thankful for those who provide for us which is why I am testifying this morning. I believe that positioning and using the snowmachine for caribou will minimize the waste of animal meat. I know there's -- sometimes the meat gets really blood shot and some people don't use it. These have been hunting local practices that have been passed down to the next generation and like we've heard, as time goes on we get more technology. Back then we used dog sleds, now we're using snowmachines. Using the positioning of animals would benefit our subsistence
users and all the eight factors of the C&T
determination would apply to this proposal.

That's all I have, thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

Appreciate you taking the time to call in today. Any
questions from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, hearing
none, thank you. Operator, we'll go to the next public
member on line.

OPERATOR: Our next one is from Kenneth
Nukwuk, your line is open.

MR. NUKWUK: Hello, can you hear me.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, I can hear
you Ken, you have the floor.

MR. NUKWUK: Yeah, this is Ken Nukwuk
from Manokotak. I'd like to thank the Bristol Bay
Subsistence Regional Advisory Council for looking into
this on the second round of wildlife proposals and in
support of this. It was presented two years ago to the
Board and it almost passed, hopefully this time around
it will come around.

To tell the story of the caribou I saw
last month in March in (In Native) Bay on my way home
from Togiak, I saw a herd of caribou, 30 to 40 of them
and they had been running, it seems like, and they were
congregated on the beach between the mouth of (In
Native) and Konak River (ph), but the tracks that
followed them, I was thinking they were probably wolves
that were chasing these caribou to a point that they
were tired so they had to rest. So when these 30 to 40
caribou took off running, one of them stayed behind, I
guess because it was so tired, so I had to go check it
out to see if it was dead or -- sure enough it was
alive, and then it came to mind, I had to look around
because I didn't have a rifle with me, I had to make
sure there was no wolves around and I was alone so I
went back on my journey came back home, never forgot
that I saw a hurt caribou, been running and there was
no snowmachine tracks, so it's not hunters that follow
these caribou when we try to get what we need.

And that's about all I can say, it would be very good if it passed this time around.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Well, I appreciate you calling in Kenneth. Thank you for your words on this. Any question or discussion from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, hearing none, again, thank you, Kenneth, for taking the time to call in today.

Operator, do we have any other public members on line.

OPERATOR: We have one more at this time, Courtenay Carty, your line is open.

MS. CARTY: Hello again, thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the Board. For the record my name is Courtenay Carty, I am the tribal administrator at the Curyung Tribal Council. We are the Federally-recognized tribe of Dillingham, Alaska.

Our tribal council supports WP20-27 as it seeks to codify a customary and traditional practice to position animals as well documented throughout Alaska, specifically this proposal speaks to position caribou. We are also in support of 26, which supports the positioning of wolves and wolverine, but opening it up, I guess to all Federal lands in Bristol Bay.

It's important that our regulations adapt to technology as quickly as our people do. In the proposal statement in the Board book, not necessarily written into the record today, it talks a lot about 1964, 1965, when James VanStone, who was really one of the first ethnographers to visit Bristol Bay came here, he documented that the primary transportation method in the winter was sled dogs. Sled dog was the primary method of transportation and snowmachines were nearly non-existent. He noted that only a few families in the bay had snowmachines at that time. 10 year later Fish and Game started their research of the subsistence resources in Bristol Bay.
and in just that one decade ADF&G documented the huge technological shift from the primary method of transportation being dogs to snowmachine. And in just over that decade, that huge shift in technology played out over time until it has become over the last 50 years, the loss of cultural practice, and the traditional knowledge of raising and working with dog teams for transportation in our region.

One thing our tribe says a lot is that we are the survivors of the survivors. Our people, specifically the Curyung Tribal Council is decedent of the orphans who are orphaned in the 1918 flu pandemic, and a lot of that is very real to us right now as we're facing Covid, but the fact of the matter is all of our contemporary tribal families descend from these children who survived the epidemic when the majority of our adults died in our community. For that reason we take our jobs very seriously to fight for what little is left. And in that regard we're talking about the traditional practice here today of using a snowmachine to position an animal, the traditional practice of positioning and aligning the current regulation with the contemporary practice of using modern technology. Not only will this -- adopting this regulation acknowledge that the customary ways of hunting are still used today in combination with our modern technologies but it will also decriminalize our people.

The Board book, on Page 880, starts with talking about how it is fundamentally impossible -- fundamentally impossible to hunt for caribou in the open flat terrain that characterizes much of Southwestern Alaska without continually moving and herding caribou, which easily (indiscernible-muffled) and do not remain stationary. Further on in the Board book it goes on to say, that hunters now fear being criminalized for this traditional practice. Well, we know the reality of the situation is that it's not just hunters fearing this, our people have been cited for using this traditional method to feed their families and communities, and that needs to stop.

Today we ask the Federal Subsistence Board to adopt Wildlife Proposal 20-27 pursuant to ANILCA Section .801, that calls for the continuation of opportunity for subsistence uses, which is essential to meet a physical, economic, traditional and cultural existence, essential to our existence, and our non-
Native relatives, family members that live in these communities, it's essential to their physical, economic, traditional and social existence, and it's important that we note that because that social fabric really ties our communities together.

Furthermore, ANILCA Section .811(b) permits the use of snowmachines, snowmobiles, technically, for subsistence purposes subject to reasonable regulations. We believe that Wildlife Proposal 20-27 is such that reasonable regulation and as such should be adopted today.

Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Courtenay. Any Board members have questions or discussion for Courtenay.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, thank you, Courtenay, for calling in and giving us your tribe's perspective on that on the proposal. You have a good day today.

MS. CARTY: Thank you so much.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Operator, did anybody else sign on for this proposal.

OPERATOR: Yes, we have two more. Our next one is Gayla Hoseth, your line is open.

MS. HOSETH: Hi, good morning, again, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. Gayla Hoseth for the record, Second Chief of Curyung Tribal Council, and I'm also the director of Natural Resources for Bristol Bay Native Association.

Well, here we are again, two years later on this proposal for positioning caribou with the use of a snowmachine. This has been a long process for two years, it's actually been a long process for three years as we were writing the proposal, due to the history of why this proposal came to your attention here again today. I wanted to thank Robbin for giving a good overview and history of this proposal and also to make note that all the agencies were at the table
this second time around on this proposal, with a
working group that had everybody who needed to put
input and all the concerns were addressed and it would
be great to have this proposal lined up with the
proposal that we have with the State of Alaska.

This ways heavy on my heart because of
the history of why we're here and the subsistence
resource that we have on our land. This proposal
shouldn't have failed two years ago. And this is where
ANILCA needs to come into play this time when there is
a conflict.

I wanted to thank the Board for the
action that was taken yesterday to get clearer
direction on issues where Federal agencies have
conflicting regulations and to allow us to
traditionally hunt on our lands and following ANILCA.
I want you to reference our tribal comments we had
during the government to government tribal
consultations, as you guys deliberate, I know some of
the Board members were on the phone and I thank you for
that, I think we spent a lot of time discussing this in
our government to government consultation and that is
open for discussion that we're authorizing that to be
read on the record.

Bristol Bay Native Corporation also
submitted comments and I don't know if Mr. Cheyette is
on the phone as second up in cue, but I also emailed
those comments to be part of the record from Bristol
Bay Native Corporation because when it was called if
there was any written comments, they were not
referenced, so I emailed those, so if those could also
be read into the record if BBNC is not able to call
into this phone line.

So I'm asking that you guys support
this proposal and I look forward to hearing how the
deliberation will go and thank you for this time.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
Does that conclude your testimony, Gayla?

MS. HOSETH: It did, thank you, Mr.
Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for
that and appreciate you taking the time to call in and
express your concerns and support for the proposal.  
Any questions or comments from the Board.  

(No comments)  

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, I appreciate you calling today. Operator, was there any other public on the line.  

OPERATOR: And we have one more at this time. Our next one is Daniel Cheyette, your line is open.  

MR. CHEYETTE: Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. I appreciate the opportunity to provide some comments on Wildlife Proposal 20-27 on behalf of Bristol Bay Native Corporation.  

As Gayla just mentioned, I did file, or submit written comments through the subsistence@fws.gov website and I hope they do ultimately get received and included in part of the deliberations.  

BBNA is the for profit corporation authorized by Congress pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to represent the economic, social, and cultural interests of the Alaska Native peoples from the Bristol Bay region. As part of our mission we are committed to protecting the Native culture and the subsistence way of life of our more than 10,000 shareholders, many of whom live in Bristol Bay and who participate in subsistence in Game Management Unit 17. And I want to reiterate the comments that all the other folks that have participated here telephonically today have already made. I believe they have done a really great job in terms of conveying to you the importance of this proposal and the customary practice of positioning themselves to harvest caribou using snowmachine and therefore this proposal is incredibly important to the region and the people who are utilizing Game Management Unit 17.  

As is described in the materials and as the OSM Staff described here today on the phone, the proposal is consistent with State Game regulations for Unit 17 and existing statewide Federal regulations that exist in other Game Management Units, so adoption of this proposal, in addition to being important to the
subsistence users will also make the regulations more consistent, both within the Game Management Unit and between this Game Management Unit and others, so it's beneficial to both the subsistence harvesters as well as the game managers -- the managers and the enforcement personnel. As is also described in the materials and, again, on the phone today, adoption of the proposal is not likely to have an impact on the population of caribou, I know there were concerns raised by one of the other Advisory Councils about the population of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd, but because managers have the ability to adjust harvest levels and the seasons, the adoption of this proposal is not likely to have an appreciable impact on those population numbers.

So, again, joining with the other folks that have commented today, the tribes and tribal organizations that have put forth this proposal and are in support of it, BBNC joins with them and asks the Board to adopt this proposal today. It would be of great benefit to the folks of Bristol Bay who rely on caribou from this Game Management Unit.

While I have the microphone I also wanted to echo the comments that the Board heard earlier today from Courtenay Carty, Gayla Hoseth and Cody Larson regarding the need for a Section .810 analysis of the 17(b) easement that would be impacted by the development of the Pebble transportation corridor. Bristol Bay Native Corporation is the land owner throughout much of all the transportation corridor alternatives, those easements burden our lands but, yet, we also appreciate as I've just described the need for our shareholders to have access to Federal lands for subsistence and the impacts from this particular project, there is no doubt, would be significant, and, therefore, we agree with those other commenters about the need for an .810 analysis of those impacts, and we believe it is incumbent on the BLM, as the manager of those easements, to insist with the Corps that it be done and that it be included in part of the ongoing NEPA process.

So I appreciate the opportunity to provide comment on both this current wildlife proposal that's under consideration as well as the need for an .810 analysis of the 17(b) easements and the Pebble transportation corridor.
Mr. Chair, thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

Thank you for calling in and taking the time today to support the proposal. Any questions from the Board, discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, hearing none, Operator does that include our on line public members?

OPERATOR: We had one more come in, if you'd like to take that now.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, we'll take that now.

OPERATOR: And Karen Linnell, your line is open.

MS. LINNELL: Good morning, thank you. Karen Linnell, Ahtna InterTribal Resource Commission.

I know I've spoken with you folks at the tribal consultation but I do want to get it on the record with this proposal, that I am in support of this proposal and the positioning of caribou.

I was serving on the Alaska Board of Game when this was brought to the State for deliberation and the Alaska Board of Game went in support of this. The terrain there is very different from my area, in that, there are no rolling hills for folks to get around or behind the herd when they're there, it's very, very flat. And I believe I told you the subsistence coordinator for the State, Hazel Nelson, had said if my dog ran away today, you could still see it running tomorrow, that's how flat it is.

And I want to say that positioning of animals is nothing new and it's been done by probably all of you when you do a moose call or a caribou call or a duck call or I've seen in the Lower 48 where people get dropped off on one side of a field and then they let their dogs loose on the other, and for you bird hunters going after grouse and what not, and you have a bird dog and you use your bird dogs, that's
positioning an animal, so this positioning of animals
is being done in other units as well.

So I just want to support this proposal
as you go through your deliberations. So I just want
to thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
Karen, for calling in today, appreciate that. Any
questions from the Board or discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
appreciate that. And if there is no other public on
line at this time we will move on.

MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

MS. WESSELS: This is Katya Wessels.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead,

Katya.

MS. WESSELS: We just received an
additional written public comment for Wildlife Proposal
20-27, may I present it at this time?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, please do,

Katya.

MS. WESSELS: We just received a
written public comment in the support of Wildlife
Proposal 20-27 from Bristol Bay Native Corporation that
submitted a letter to the Federal Subsistence Board in
regard to that and they say that they support the
Wildlife Proposal 20-27 regarding the use of
snowmachine to take caribou in Game Management Unit 17.

And this is the end of the written
public comment on 20-27, thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

MS. WESSELS: Oh, I'm sorry, Mr.
Chairman, I didn't go to the second page, they actually
have a longer letter, my apologies.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, you still have the floor Katya.

MS. WESSELS: So they also say that the Wildlife Proposal 20-27, if adopted, would allow subsistence users to use snowmachines to hunt caribou so long as hunters only shoot caribou from stationary machine. This proposal is supported by both the Bristol Bay and Western Interior Advisory Councils as well as by Office of Subsistence Management Staff.

The proposal is consistent with State game regulations for Unit 17 and existing statewide Federal regulations and is consistent with existing Federal regulations in other game units, accordingly, adoption of this proposal would reduce regulatory complexity across State and Federally-managed areas and would benefit both subsistence users and law enforcement personnel without encouraging prohibited activities; for example, the use of snowmachine to herd, drive, or molest wildlife. For these reasons BBNC supports WP20-27 and encourages the Federal Subsistence Board to adopt it.

The lone critic of this proposal is the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta Advisory Council that is concerned about the recent decline of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd. These concerns, however, is at odds with the conclusions of OSM Staff, who believes the proposal would not significantly alter caribou populations in Unit 17 because snowmachines are already extensively used to access hunting areas and State and Federal managers will control harvest levels by manipulating the seasons and limits.

BBNC urges the Federal Subsistence Board to adopt this proposal as recommended by Bristol Bay and Western Interior Advisory Councils and OSM Staff.

This concludes the presentation of the written public comment by the Bristol Bay Native Corporation.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for the update, Katya.
Okay, with that we'll move on to Regional Advisory Council recommendation, Chair.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yes, thank you. This is Nanci Morris Lyon, Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council Chair. Can you hear me just fine?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Got you good, Nanci, you have the floor.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Okay, thank you. And I would also like to thank my neighbors out here in the district that have called in on this.

We had a list of hunters in the area that are very highly regarded and if you've ever heard from an A Team it was today so please take their testimony to heart.

We supported WP20-27. We feel it will clarify the Federal hunting regulations. It will align it with the recent State of Alaska hunting regulations and reduce regulatory complexity between State and Federal regulation. The Council supports the proposal stating that using snowmachines to assist in taking a caribou and allowing caribou to be shot from a stationary snowmachine is a longstanding practice among rural residents of our region and any conservation concerns can be addressed through regulatory changes to protect the caribou herd if necessary.

I would also like to add that Mr. Nukwuk, who was on the phone this morning, and he has spent years in working with us, as you heard, we declined the proposal ourselves, and we had serious concerns to make sure that we were not having -- turning our residents into law breakers by not having clear understanding before we finally passed this proposal. We have literally worked for years on this and everybody has put a lot of time and energy into it and a lot of hard thought out covering every which direction we can to make sure this is complete. We were very disappointed when it was not accepted last year. And we recognize that our neighbors from the Yukon Kuskokwim are opposing this proposal but their justification has more to do with conservation of the caribou than it does with the actual proposal, and, while we understand and 100 percent sympathize with conservation efforts on this caribou herd as it is the
main supplement for our diets out here as well, this proposal is not addressing the caribou, it is a method and means proposal, and we think it should be separated from that.

I would also ask that those of you on the Board consider very carefully if your vote is coming from your own company policy on how you may want to proceed forward and if you, maybe, should consider not placing a vote, because ANILCA does allow for this.

And with that I will conclude my testimony.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions for Nanci from the Board, discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, I appreciate it. We’ll move on to tribal Alaska Native Corporation comments, Native Liaison, Orville.

MR. LIND: Good morning, Mr. Chair, can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I got you loud and clear.

MR. LIND: Good morning, Federal Subsistence Board members, Regional Advisory Council Chairs. My name is Orville Lind. I'm the Native Liaison for the Office of Subsistence Management.

First of all, I would just like to thank the tribal leaders and corporate leaders to chime in this morning. I thought the public comment session is what we look forward to and it has gotten a lot more involved, so, again, my thanks go out to the tribal leaders.

During the session we had tribal consultation and ANCSA session on September 30th, we did not have any comments to Wildlife Proposal 20-27.

That's all I have, Mr. Chair.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Orville. We'll move on to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, State Liaison.

MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the record Fish and Game is neutral on this proposal, and I'm sure you're noting that usually when it comes to aligning State and Federal regulations we do support those efforts. But in this regard we are just a neutral stance to point out our concerns over the Mulchatna Caribou Herd and what enacting this regulation may do for the level of disturbance and what that means for energetic demands on that herd given its low levels. But no way are we standing in the way of the Board if their desire is to pass this proposal.

Thank you.

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chair, this is Jack Reakoff, Chair of WIRAC.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Jack, you have the floor.

MR. REAKOFF: Yeah, Western Interior and YKDelta sees these proposals also because we have customary and traditional use from some membership in our region.

The Council supported WP20-27 and one of the members was concerned about the decline of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd, but in our discussion, the seasons and bag limits address the conservation concerns. This is a methods and means of regulation, and so -- for the use of Sno-Gos for taking caribou. And this proposal actually addresses the harassment issue that was posed with the use of snowmachines or Sno-Go for taking caribou.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Jack. Any other questions for the State, comments.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll move on to the InterAgency Staff Committee comments, ISC Chair.
MS. WORKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's Suzanne Worker. I just want to point out that we missed one of the Regional Advisory Councils for WP20-27, and I believe Alissa Rogers for the YKRAC is on the phone.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, go ahead.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I didn't realize there was another one, thank you for that, Suzanne.

MS. ROGERS: Hello, can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Alissa, you have the floor.

MS. ROGERS: All right, thank you, sorry about that. Yeah, this is Alissa Rogers, the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta Subsistence Regional Advisory Council, Madame Chair.

And our Council had opposed WP20-27 for the main purpose that there was overriding concerns about the recent dramatic decline of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd and at this time the Council didn't feel it was an appropriate time to be discussing hunting methods to give an optical illusion of the ability to go out hunting. We definitely are in support of the Bristol Bay region and them wanting to clean up language, but, because we had such drastic concerns about and taking such drastic measures to close this herd, especially on Unit 18 side, we support the Mulchatna Caribou's recovery and we want to avoid any further harm to the herd that would cause by stress or being pursued by snowmachine or any type of hunting or methods.

After listening to the current comments and the main focus of this proposal, in my personal opinion, it sounds really, really good and I wished we knew this at the time when we were discussing this because if we would take it away from actually distinguishing between caribou and just as a clean up language, I'm sure this would have been totally different and my guess is that there were a lot of other Councils and publics that had viewed that just
the way that we viewed it, but my Council had come
across -- we opposed this because we are very concerned
about the Mulchatna Caribou Herd and giving the optics
that if we're going to start allowing snowmachine
hunters then there might be an incline to actually go
hunting more while we're trying to keep this herd
closed for recovery of the population.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
Alissa. Any questions or comments for Alissa from the
Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
Alissa for that. Any other Regional Advisory Council
Chairs.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
hearing none.....

MR. DOOLITTLE: No, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hello, was that
you Tom.

MS. WORKER: Mr. Chair, it's Suzanne.

I think we got them all.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, thank you
very much. We'll move on to InterAgency Staff
Committee comments, ISC Chair.

MS. WORKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This is Suzanne Worker.

The InterAgency Staff Committee agrees
with the Bristol Bay Subsistence Regional Advisory
Council's recommendation to adopt this proposal, which
provides specific guidance about how snowmachines can
be used to harvest caribou and reduces uncertainty for
users.

Testimony from local subsistence users
and members of the Bristol Cay Council supported the
clarification of how snowmachines can be used to position hunters while harvesting caribou in these regions. Such equipment has long been used for these purposes and more specific regulations would help them continue these traditions while reducing the concerns about potential enforcement actions.

Though the Yukon Delta Subsistence Regional Advisory Council opposed the adoption of this proposal due to their concerns about the conservation status of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd, it is important to note that the proposed regulation does not allow any practices not currently allowed under Federal regulations, rather it provides specific guidelines that may be useful to subsistence users as they judge whether their hunting practices are lawful.

The proposed regulation is consistent with existing State regulations addressing the use of snowmachines to harvest caribou in Unit 17. Adoption of this proposal will reduce regulatory complexity across State and Federal jurisdictions which will benefit both subsistence users and law enforcement officials.

In addition, the proposed regulation is consistent with the existing statewide Federal regulation which prohibits the use of motorized vehicles to drive, herd or molest wildlife. Adopting this proposal would support the intent of that regulation as well as other Federal agency specific regulations that have similar language and intent.

It is notable that the Board has previously approved regulations specifying how snowmachines can be used for caribou hunting in other units and that these have been implemented to address both subsistence needs and enforcement concerns. The Board may also want to consider a more universal approach to identifying the appropriate use of snowmachines for harvest of animals by Federally-qualified subsistence users. Creation of regulations that are enforceable, are compatible with existing Federal and State regulations and allow efficient harvest may be worth further discussion and evaluation.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

That concludes the ISC comment.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions, comments for the ISC Staff.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll open the floor for Board discussion with Council Chairs and State Liaison.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll open the floor for Federal Board action on this proposal.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, Greg Siekaniec with Fish and Wildlife Service.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Greg, you have the floor.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to move to adopt Proposal WP20-27. The proposed language is shown on Page 873 of the Board book. Following a second, I will provide justification for why I intend to support my motion.

MR. C. BROWER: Second.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you. It is clear from a long history of public testimony in addition to Council and Board meeting discussions the use of snowmachines for subsistence purposes is a traditional practice statewide. This proposal supports the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council effort to find a solution to develop clear regulatory language for use of snowmachines to harvest caribou.

The proposal is also supported by the Western Interior Regional Advisory Council.

I commend the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council for their efforts to develop a solution that involves input from a diverse group of people and agencies through the working group. The regulatory language provided in this proposal is enforceable and clearly articulates how hunters may use snowmachines to assist in the taking of caribou while remaining in compliance with existing regulations.
In addition, the regulation also aligns with State regulation, which will reduce regulatory confusion that may have existed on the land. Adoption of this proposal will reduce the uncertainty for hunters regarding legal use of snowmachines.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Greg. The floor is open for Board discussion, deliberation.

(No comments)

MR. C. BROWER: Question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been called. We’ll do roll call, Tom, please.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chair. One note of clarification, I want to make sure to see if Casey Burns is on line as Chad Padgett's proxy at the moment.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Operator, is Casey Burns on line?

OPERATOR: Yes, let me open his line. One moment. And Casey Burns your line is open.

MR. BURNS: Thanks.

MR. DOOLITTLE: And, Casey, you're with us as.....

MR. BURNS: Yes, I'm here now. I *1 and I'm in. Can you hear me?

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yes, just fine, thank you.

MR. BURNS: All right, thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: We're doing the roll call vote on WP20-27.
This is WP20-27 which requests a unit specific regulation for Unit 17 allowing use of a snowmachine to assist in the taking of a caribou and allowing caribou to be shot from a stationary snowmachine using the regulatory language adopted by the Alaska Board of Game, which you can see on Page 870 of your book.

We'll start off with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Greg Siekaniec.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Tom. Yes, I support in deference to the Bristol Bay and Western Interior Advisory Councils, and for the justification I provided.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, very much, Greg.

Bureau of Indian Affairs, Gene Peltola.

MR. PELTOLA: Yes, the Bureau of Indian Affairs votes to support the proposal and recognizing deference to the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council and Western Interior Regional Advisory Council. In addition to, it is in direct conflict with the recommendation from the Yukon Delta Regional Advisory Council, although we think their concerns could be more appropriately addressed by seasons and bag limit limitations as opposed to a method and means approach, in addition to the appropriate agency specific regulatory oversight.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, very much Gene.

Rhonda Pitka.

MS. PITKA: I support in deference to the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council and the Western Interior Regional Advisory Council.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Rhonda.

Charlie Brower.
MR. C. BROWER: I support WP20-27 as recommended by OSM and Western Interior and the Bristol Bay Advisory Council.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Charlie.

U.S. Forest Service, David Schmid.

MR. SCHMID: Yes, I support WP20-27 with the justification provided by the Fish and Wildlife Service as well as in deference to the Bristol Bay and Western Interior Regional Advisory Councils, and share the same opinion that the BIA offered with the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta's opposition to this proposal.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, very much Dave.

National Park Service, Donald Striker.

MR. STRIKER: National Park Service supports for the reasons articulated by Fish and Wildlife, Greg, and in deference to the two RACs, and also in deference to the broad local support. And I'd just like to comment how much I really appreciated the time of all the folks who took the opportunity to call in and help clarify this issue for me.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, very much Don.

Bureau of Land Management, Casey Burns.

MR. BURNS: Yes, BLM will support with the justification provided by the Fish and Wildlife Service and in deference to the Bristol Bay and Western Interior Councils.

Thanks.

Casey.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, very much
And Chairman Anthony Christianson.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support in
deferece to the two RACs that supported.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: The motion passes
unanimously. Thank you. And it looks like we're going
to go on, Mr. Chair, to WP20-26.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, and we'll
call on the Staff to give us the analysis.

Thank you.

MS. LAVINE: Hello, Mr. Chair and
members of the Board, can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, we hear
you fine.

MS. LAVINE: Excellent. Okay. So once
again my name is Robbin Lavine and I'm an
anthropologist at the Office of Subsistence Management.
The analysis for Wildlife Proposal 20-26 begins on Page
847 of your Board book.

Wildlife Proposal 20-26 was submitted
by the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council. The
proposal requests that Federally-qualified subsistence
users be allowed to use a snowmachine to position
wolves and wolverines for harvest on Bureau of Land
Management lands in Units 9B, 9C, 17B and 17C provided
the animals are not shot from a moving snowmachine.

The proponent states that the use of
snowmachines to position wolves and wolverines is a
traditional practice in rural areas and the proposed
regulation will mirror Federal regulations in Unit 23.

Currently the wolf population in Units
9 and 17 is believed to be stable. Less is known about
the resident wolverine population, and this change in
regulation could result in increased biological
vulnerability. From those who reported harvest, the
majority of wolves harvested in the most recent five
year reporting period were taken by firearm, while the
majority of wolverine harvest over the same years was
by trapping. The proposed regulation may not result in an increase in harvest by trap or snare, however such regulatory changes could increase the take of wolves and wolverines by firearm and may result in more opportunistic harvest. If this proposal were to pass, the regulations for the use of snowmachines when harvesting wolves or wolverines would be different on State managed lands, however, this is already the case and should the proposal be adopted it would not add regulatory complexity that does not already exist.

Specifically in State regulations a snowmachine may be used to position a hunter to select an individual wolf for harvest, and wolves may be shot from a stationary snowmachine. If this proposal were to pass then in Federal regulations, a snowmachine could be used to position a wolf and wolverine for harvest and either could be shot from a stationary snowmachine.

Finally, for the use of snowmachines for subsistence purposes these are -- this is a traditional practice in the Bristol Bay area and statewide, it is important to note that the Board adopted a similar regulation in Unit 23 in recognition of the snowmachine as a customary and traditional method of harvest.

The OSM conclusion is to support Proposal 20-26.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any question for the Staff on the presentation.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. We'll move to summary of public comment, Regional Council Coordinator.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. Katya Wessels, OSM, for the record.

We received two written public comments on Wildlife Proposal 20-26. One in support and one in opposition.
The first comment, the one in opposition came from Alaskans for Wildlife and any Cooperating Entities. They allege that positioning of wildlife for harvest will result in chasing and harassing wildlife to exhaustion. They also claim that it would be impossible to enforce the regulations related to positioning and the Alaskan Wildlife Troopers do not understand the regulations which will result in widespread abuse. This, in turn, will give subsistence the reputation of abuse when it really needs public support.

The second comment that we received came from the Bristol Bay Native Corporation and the Corporation conditionally supports Wildlife Proposal 20-26 regarding the use of snowmachines to position wolves and wolverines for harvest but urges the Board to expand the application of the proposal to all Federal lands within the applicable Game Management Units.

And since we received these comments at the last minute, I will have to read it in their entirety, I didn't have time to summarize them so sorry about that.

BBNC says that, if adopted as proposed WP20-26 would allow subsistence users to use snowmachines to position wolves and wolverines in Game Management Units 17B and 17C on BLM managed lands only. BBNC joins with other Bristol Bay area tribes and tribal organizations to urge the Board to apply this proposal more broadly to additional Federal lands within Game Management Unit 17.

As has been described in the meeting materials, BLM manages very little land in Game Management Unit 17B and 17C. One percent in 17B and 10 percent in 17C. It follows that adoption of this proposals as is would apply very limited additional benefit to subsistence users. It is also true that application of proposal 20-26 more broadly across other Federal public lands in Unit 17B and 17C while benefitting subsistence users would not significantly threaten the wolf or wolverine populations because there is little additional Federal lands in these units. Specifically, a limited amount of lands on the west side of Unit 17C that is part of the Togiak National Wildlife Refuge and an even smaller amount of
acres of the east side of Unit 17B that is part of
Lake Clark National Park. Simply put, the relatively
small amount of Federally-managed acres in these two
Game Management Units belie concerns about threats of
the wolf and wolverine populations in these units that
a broader application of this proposal could cost.

More pointedly, the apparent reluctance
to apply Wildlife Proposal 20-26 to lands within Game
Management Units 17B and 17C managed by either the U.S.
Fish and Wildlife Service or National Park Service
contravenes the clear mandate of ANILCA, Title VIII.
The meeting materials suggest this proposal cannot be
applied across lands managed by either of those two
agencies because agency specific regulations
promulgated by both of those agencies preclude the use
of snowmachine to position animals. As is described
above, such regulation should yield to rural Alaskan
subsistence needs. Congress enacted Title VIII to
protect subsistence uses of resources on Federal lands
by rural subsistence users. This specific directive
from Congress shall prevail over agency promulgated
regulatory provisions that precludes the use of
snowmachines to position animals on Park and Refuge
land. First the Board has concluded that the use of
snowmachines to position wolves and wolverines is a
customary and traditional subsistence practice, and
second, that Game Management Units 17B and 17C do not
encompass vast acreage of Federal lands such as that
application of these proposals -- proposal on Refuge
and Park Service lands is unlikely to have significant
impacts to wolves and wolverine populations, and,
third, Congress expressed the clear intent to protect
the subsistence use of resources on Federal public
lands in enacting Title VIII of ANILCA. The Board
should apply Wildlife Proposal 20-26 across all Federal
lands in Game Management Units 17B and 17C.

That concludes my presentation of the

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
Katya. With that we'll open up the floor to public
testimony we have on line.

OPERATOR: And, again, for those who
would like to make comment you may press *1, and our
first question or comment comes from Robbin Chaney, your line is open.

MS. CHANEY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would just like to reiterate a lot of my first comment on the prior proposal, and, again, I'm also testifying on behalf of my son who couldn't stay on the line all morning.

We are in favor of this proposal as it decriminalizes traditional hunting practices here as they hunt on snowmachines. But our hunters here, my family hunt efficiently and respectfully of these animals as possible, and if you are a hunter you understand that it's very dynamic, animals aren't static, hunters aren't static, and the main thing is that you have to be safe and respectful of the animal that you're harvesting.

To my understanding, the land that this affects is very small and would align with regulations in all of the surrounding land but we -- our family is in favor of this proposal.

Quyana.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any other on line -- thank you for that comment, anybody else on line, Operator.

OPERATOR: And we have one more at this time from Courtenay Carty, your line is open.

MS. CARTY: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the Board, for your service and this opportunity.

The Curyung Tribe would just like to reiterate our comments in regards to the traditional and customary use of -- I guess, use of snowmachine now in these modern times, but the practice of positioning animals, we do support this proposal and would support the amendment of opening it to be applicable on all Federal lands in Bristol Bay.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Courtenay. Any questions or comments.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for testifying. Operator, was there anybody else on line who would like to testify to this proposal.

OPERATOR: We had another one come in from Gayla Hoseth, your line is open.

MS. HOSETH: Thank you. Hello again, everybody, members of the Board. Gayla Hoseth, Second Chief, Curyung Tribal Council and also director of Natural Resources for Bristol Bay Native Association.

I wanted to extend my thank you for the actions that were taken on WP20-27, it's been a long process, like I stated in my last testimony.

WP20-26 falls along the same lines of my last testimony of what I testified on, and I would just ask for the Board to consider opening this up to all Federal land in Game Management Units 9B, 9C, 17B and 17C due to the fact that there are only four percent of BLM lands within the Bristol Bay region.

This also was written and submitted by the Bristol Bay Subsistence Regional Advisory Council and just appreciate all the work that has been put into these efforts to allow for our traditional ways of hunting to be in regulation.

And thank you for hearing our voices and thank you to everybody who called in and testified in support of our traditional ways of life.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for those comments. Appreciate you taking the time to call in. Anybody else on line, Operator, who would like to speak to this proposal.

OPERATOR: And I have no more in cue at this time.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. All right, that will conclude our public testimony on this proposal. We'll move on to the Regional Advisory Council recommendation, Chair.
MS. MORRIS LYON: Yes, thank you. Nanci Morris Lyon, Bristol Bay Regional Subsistence Advisory Council Chair.

We support WP20-26. The use of snowmachines to position wolves and wolverines for harvest is a traditional and common practice in the Bristol Bay area. No conservation concerns exist for wolf and wolverine. The proposed regulation clarifies what is allowed. The local users support the use of snowmachines to position wolves and wolverines for the harvest on BLM lands. The Federal Subsistence Board adopted a similar regulation in Unit 23 recognizing snowmachine is a customary and traditional harvest method.

And I would, again, thank my regional users for calling in and supporting these proposals, it's certainly a big help and I would also add that without the rest of my Council here I cannot speak on their behalf, but, I, too, agree with BBNCs analysis that to make this region-wide would make a lot of sense and I would not have a sense that it would be disagreed with amongst my Council members.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Nanci. Any questions for the Chair from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I'm not going to mess it up this time. Is there another Regional Council Chair for this one?

MS. ROGERS: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair. Alissa Rogers with the YKDelta Subsistence Regional Advisory Council.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor.

MS. ROGERS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Through the Chair, my name is Alissa Nadine Rogers and I'm the Madame Chair of the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta Subsistence Regional Advisory Council.

Our Council is in support of WP20-26.
The Council supports this proposal because it would increase opportunity for subsistence hunters to harvest a wolf or wolverine. Ample wolf land wolverine populations in the area may help to reduce predator pressure, snowmachine is transportation for hunters and fishers and this proposal would allow additional opportunity to harvest wolf or wolverine.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chair, this is Jack Reakoff, WIRAC.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, you have the floor, Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: Western Interior Regional Council unanimously supported WP20-26. We have residents in our region that have C&T. The travel conditions are becoming more difficult due to climate change and using snowmachines allows users to access resources in a more economically viable way. This proposal would only affect a very small portion of BLM land, but it would have alignment with the State regulations and so I feel that in the future, for the next round, that this may be a statewide proposal where snowmachines are used.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Jack. Is there any other Council Chairs who wish to speak to this proposal.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll move on to Tribal/Alaska Native Corporation comments, Native Liaison Orville Lind.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Operator, is Orville available.

OPERATOR: One moment. I do show that he has disconnected. One moment, there he is. And, Orville, your line is open.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
Operator.

OPERATOR: And, again, Orville Lind,
your line is open.

MR. LIND: Thank you. Can you hear me
now? Can you hear me now?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, I got you
loud and clear Orville, you have the floor.

MR. LIND: I just dropped off here but
I'm glad to be back on.

It is my turn, correct?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have
the floor.

MR. LIND: Thank you, Mr. Chair and
Federal Subsistence Board members and Regional Advisory
Council Chairs. My name is Orville Lind, Native
Liaison for the Office of Subsistence Management.

During the session on 9/30 -- September
30th, I'm sorry, consultation, there were no comments
made on WP20-26.

That's all I have, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
Orville. Hearing no comments we'll move on to the
Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments, Liaison.

MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Chairman.
For the record, Ben Mulligan, Alaska Department of Fish
and Game.

We do not have an issue with the part
of the proposal that has to do with positioning wolves,
given our own intensive management efforts in the area,
allowing hunters to position the animals for harvest
would enhance hunter success and aide in the
Department's effort to increase moose and caribou
survival in these units.

However, we do oppose the portion that
allows the use of snowmachine to position wolverines,
given their complex life histories, you know, as the proposal acknowledges, any regulation change could increase the harvest of this species and wolverines range widely naturally current low densities and those complex life histories that make them vulnerable to increased harvest, and especially during certain parts of the year when they're in their denning period.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions from the Board, discussion with the State.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll move on to InterAgency Staff Committee recommendation comment, ISC Chair.

MS. WORKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This is Suzanne Worker.

The InterAgency Staff Committee has identified several points for the Board to consider in their deliberation of Proposal WP20-26.

Testimony from members of the Bristol Bay Subsistence Regional Advisory Council and local subsistence users supported the clarification of how snowmachines can be used while harvesting wolves and wolverines in these units. Such equipment has long been used for these purposes and the proposed regulations will help subsistence users continue these traditions while reducing the concerns about potential enforcement action.

Little is known about wolf or wolverine populations and harvest levels in these units. Wolverines, in particular, occur at low densities and are vulnerable to hunters on snowmachines. Using snowmachines to position and shoot wolverines may present conservation concerns if it results in increased harvest, however, the ISC also noted that harvest of wolves and/or wolverines by rural residents while snowmachining is typically opportunistic, which may limit negative impacts to either species.

This regulation would apply only on BLM managed lands and would result in regulatory complexity
across lands of differing Federal status. In addition, BLM managed lands compromise only four percent of Units 9 and 17 so this regulation would apply to only a fraction of the total land area. Regulatory complexity between State and Federal regulations would also increase given that State regulations allow a snowmachine to be used to position a hunter to select an individual wolf for harvest, provided the machine is stationary when shooting, but does not allow the same for wolverines.

It is notable that the Board has previously approved regulations specifying how snowmachines can be used for wolf and wolverine hunting in Unit 23 and that these regulations have also been implemented to address both subsistence needs and enforcement concerns.

The Board may also want to consider a more universal approach to identifying the appropriate use of snowmachines for harvest of animals by Federally-qualified subsistence users. Creation of regulations that are enforceable, are compatible with existing State and Federal regulations and allow efficient harvest may be worth further discussion and evaluation.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions from the Board to the ISC.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll go to Board discussion with the Chairs and the State Liaison.

MR. PELTOLA: Yes, Mr. Chair, BIA.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, BIA you have the floor. Go ahead, Gene.

MR. PELTOLA: Good morning, all. So I was wondering if I could ask a question of the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council Chair because they're the proponent.

The proposal as written, as on BLM
managed lands only, and I was curious, what was the process involved with the RAC to come up with the proposal and why were BLM lands only identified in the proposal?

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I believe that's for Nanci.

MR. PELTOLA: Yeah, correct, sorry about that. Yes, for Nanci.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Is Nanci available, Operator, can you make her line open please.

OPERATOR: One moment, let me locate.....

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yes, I am available now, my call was dropped.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. Gene, do you want to restate your question for Nanci, please.

MR. PELTOLA: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good morning, Nanci, this is Gene at BIA. So I was looking at the proposal and it stipulated that the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council was the proponent, so could you explain to the Board the process that the RAC went through to come up with the proposal, one, and, two, why did you limit -- why did the RAC limit it to BLM managed lands only.

Thank you.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yes, absolutely. So thank you for the question, Gene. And this proposal was kind of brought along with the caribou proposal. It was pointed out that there was a need for this as well in the region. A lot of the time, while folks are out hunting, caribou or moose, they need to have the ability to harvest our predators as well, and, again, not wanting to be illegal and trying to justify a practice that's been in use already.

I think it was merely an oversight on our part, we were not targeting, so to speak, BLM lands, by any means, which is why I also stated that I
felt, even though my Council was not with me today, 
that they would support increasing it to include the 
rest of the Federal lands.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Nanci, 
appreciate it. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

Thank you for answering that Nanci.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead, 
you have the floor.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Greg Siekaniec, Fish
and Wildlife Service. Suzanne, when you were providing
your ISC thoughts and comments, you had something that
I'm -- let me make sure I understand.

You said that the Board might want to
consider a more appropriate, what use or definition,
around the use of snowmachines in regulations, could
you help me, what you were referring to there a little
bit.

MS. WORKER: Thank you, Mr. Siekaniec.
Over the years there's been a lot of discussion about
the specific language that we use, are we positioning
animals, are we positioning hunters, and I believe this
comment was in reference to that. Just coming to a
common understanding about how we approach these
regulations. And this is a discussion that came up
during the deliberation two years ago as well as
whether or not this, you know, is something that is --
should be addressed at a statewide level or is it
better handled regionally. So I think the ISC
intention is just drawing attention to those issues.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Suzanne.
Mr. Chair, could I ask one more question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Greg, you
have the floor.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you. Suzanne, I
think -- well, we heard earlier that if the Fish and
Wildlife Service, and I believe Lake Clark National
Park, these were viewed also within this proposal,
there would be a, now, a conflict between the
regulations that exist for Parks and Refuges, but would
be in alignment with BLM, but I -- since this proposal
did not have those Federal lands included in it, there
was -- was there any discussion in the ISC about that?

MS. WORKER: So I missed the very last
part of your question, can you restate that?

MR. SIEKANIEC: Sure. I said so since
this proposal was oriented towards BLM land and in the
testimony I heard, that there would be a conflict
between Lake Clark National Park land and Togiak land
in regulation, did the ISC have any discussions about
Togiak lands and Lake Clark National Park land in
relation to this?

MS. WORKER: I don't remember that we
had a specific discussion about extending the
regulation on to those lands, if that's your question.
There is an acknowledgement that it results in
regulatory complexity between Federal lands of
different status, different management status. Is that
what you're asking?

MR. SIEKANIEC: Yeah, thank you, that's
what I was asking. So there was no discussion or
deliberation on that. Yeah, Mr. Chair, thank you very
much for allowing me to ask those questions.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, thank you.

Any other questions from the Board.

MR. C. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead,
Charlie.

MR. C. BROWER: So the Regional Council
wants BLM lands but there's a request to go all on
Federal lands, will there be a problem with the
regulatory regulations with BLM, Wildlife Service, as
long as these -- put these together -- or what's the
status on that, I have the same concern as Greg, I mean
what's going to happen?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I guess that
would be a question that maybe we would have ISC
answer.
MS. WORKER: So Mr. Brower, the question is what happens on Refuge and Park lands if this regulation is implemented; is that correct?

MR. C. BROWER: Roger.

MS. WORKER: Nothing would change on those lands. This regulation would apply only to BLM lands. And so use of the snowmachine in this manner to harvest wolves and wolverines would not be allowed on Park and Refuge lands.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Gene, you have the floor.

MR. PELTOLA: So, Mr. Chair, I brought up the question not necessarily to advocate for one position or another, but I wanted to identify that -- and it came to my mind because we did hear a Dillingham, or Bristol Bay region entity express the desire for it to be applied to all Federal lands, but if the Board was to go through this and act upon this proposal, and only address BLM managed lands, and preclude the others, here's the example where opportunity may not be provided, which could have been otherwise, or vice versa, without clear direction and guidance between agency specific and Federal subsistence regulations.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, this is Greg.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Greg, you have the floor.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Gene, I agree with what you're thinking about there. And this just reminds me a lot of where we were last time with the WP20-27 that we managed to get, you know, very common language that addressed both, you know, the Fish and Wildlife Service concerns in regards to that and this one seems like it's putting us right back in the same place, so having conflicting regulations and, you know, with language that was similar to what we had just passed, I think we could avoid that.

So, thank you.
MR. PELTOLA: Yeah, Mr. Chair. Yes, I agree, Greg. So the options, if the Board wanted to proceed and get closer to being inclusive rather than exclusive, the agency making the motion could reword the motion to more clearly align with the caribou regs which were just passed, or if it's felt that it could not be done within the timeframe of this meeting, do a thorough, such that that could be appropriately addressed in the manner to be more acceptable.

Does that make sense?

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, Greg.

MR. LORD: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead, Greg and then Ken.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Yeah, Gene, I absolutely agree with you, I think you hit, you know, the nail kind of right on the head, from the standpoint of trying to get a better alignment might be best made to a deferral where we can come back with this quicker, rather than waiting for the next wildlife meeting.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Ken, you have the floor.

MR. LORD: Mr. Chair. I would also urge the Board, if they want to go down this path of a deferral, which would give the Staff time to analyze the impacts on Fish and Wildlife Service and Park Service lands, right now the administrative record doesn't have any such analysis, and we would certainly be in a better position from a defensibility perspective if they were given an opportunity to put that analysis together.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Ken.

MR. BURNS: This is Casey with BLM.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have the floor.

MR. BURNS: So we had prepared a motion, working with Chad on this, but we had also talked about deferral and, yeah, I feel a little bit uncertain, you know, not being the official Board member, but just acting in that capacity right now, to change what Chad had made, but we did discuss a deferral so I would potentially be comfortable making that motion, and I know I need to maybe do something in that regard, but I just wanted to float that out there before I do that.

MR. C. BROWER: You have that privilege, you're standing in.

(Laughter)

MR. BURNS: All right. I'm going to make the motion to defer WP20-26, and reexamine at the summer meeting in August, if that's appropriate.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: If you can get a second I think we can get concurrence from the Council on that.

MR. PELTOLA: Second, BIA.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, we have a second now. Thank you guys. Yeah, I think it would make sense, too, and like you said it would follow suit with the other regulations we have going on and get a better analysis on it and provide the justification for the record like Ken's stating. And so maybe deferral is the option at this time so we can get it right the first time.

So I open the floor for discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: There's a motion on the floor to defer to the summer meeting.

MR. C. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Charlie.
MR. C. BROWER: So we bring this back, and defer for the August meeting, and we get it right in August, they'll be able to do their harvesting of animals from all lands, hopefully not just BLM lands, if something comes up -- or we come up with something; is that right?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, that's what we're talking about, is to defer it, Charlie, so we can get a more comprehensive analysis done to include additional lands that haven't been worked up yet by the Staff, so that's what the deferral would do.

MR. DOOLITTLE: To the Board, this is Tom. Ken, could we clarify whether we can address the deferral after we've gone through the regulatory cycle or would that deferral truly have to be addressed in 2022?

MR. LORD: No, we can defer until August that's perfectly acceptable.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay, thank you for that clarification, Ken.

MR. LORD: You're welcome.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead, Greg.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So I would, you know, really encourage the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Committee to engage this working group discussion along with OSM and InterAgency Staff Committee, really try and come up with, you know, the definition again as they did this last time, it was very successful and also then addressed the -- certainly the Fish and Wildlife Service regulation that's on the books and made them very compatible.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for that insight, Greg.

Did I hear somebody calling for the question. Any further Board discussion.
MS. MORRIS LYON: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yes, Mr. Chair, this is the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council Chair and I would just commit to being a part of that working group and gladly seeing that it's done right the first time.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for that Nanci.

MR. C. BROWER: Yes there was a question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's called. The motion on the floor is to defer this to the summer work session.

MR. C. BROWER: And ask for unanimous consent.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, hearing no opposition to the motion, the motion carries unanimously, and it'll be deferred to the summer work session.

All right, that will conclude the morning session. I appreciate the efforts this morning and we'll try to get back on the call in one hour at 1:15, if that works for everybody. Again, please try to maintain your line and we'll see you guys in an hour.

(Off record)

(On record)

MR. DOOLITTLE: Hopefully we've gotten most people back, I know some people are trying to call in. This is Tom. And I'll start just through the Chair, a roll call, to make sure we have quorum of the Board before we get going.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, thanks, Tom, for that, go ahead and conduct a roll call and make sure we're here and back and doing business and
we'll get started where we left off.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay. So we have

Chairman Christianson.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep.

MR. DOOLITTLE: U.S. Forest Service, is Dave Schmid on.

MR. SCHMID: Yeah, I'm on, and hey, Tom, and Mr. Chair, I'm going to have to step away at around 2:00 o'clock for an hour for a call back east, Wayne Owen will be sitting in my place there for the Forest Service during that hour or so.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay. We'll make sure that he's on the speaker's list, Dave, so that he's in the cue.

MR. SCHMID: Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Is Charlie back on yet.

(No comments)

MR. DOOLITTLE: No Charlie yet. Casey, you're on deck?

MR. BURNS: I'm here and Chad should be back within a half hour or so but I'll be sitting in until that time.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay, thank you, Sir.

Is Rhonda Pitka on.

MS. PITKA: Yes, I am, thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: All right, Rhonda, great.

National Park Service, is Don Striker on.

MR. REAM: Good afternoon, Tom. This is Joshua Ream, I'm the Park Service representative to
the InterAgency Staff Committee, and Don has asked me to sit in for up to an hour this afternoon.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay, Josh, you're in the cue.

MR. REAM: Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Greg Siekaniec, are you on board yet, Greg.

(No comments)

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay, Greg's still trying to get in and Charlie.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Tom, this is Tony here, that's why I figured 1:15 would be a good time so a few minutes of trying to get everybody lined up again, so we'll give them a few more minutes.

MR. DOOLITTLE: You bet, Mr. Chair.

(Pause)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Are we having success with our Regional Advisory Council Chairs, Tom?

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, I'll start to go through that here.

I'll first start with the State of Alaska, Ben Mulligan, are you on?

MR. MULLIGAN: The State is here, Sir.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Alrighty, good to hear your voice, Ben.

And I'll go to the Regional Advisory Councils. Is Don Hernandez in.

(No comments)

MR. DOOLITTLE: I don't hear Don. Is Greg Encelewski in?

MR. SIEKANIEC: Hey, Tom, this is Greg, I'm now on.
MR. DOOLITTLE: Great, Greg, glad to have you with us. And we're just waiting on Charlie.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Yeah, sorry about that, it took a little while to get through.

MR. DOOLITTLE: No problem. Nanci Lyon, are you on line?

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yes, I'm available.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Nanci.

Alissa Rogers, are you on line?

(No comments)

MR. DOOLITTLE: I don't hear Alissa yet.

Jack Reakoff, are you on line?

MR. REAKOFF: Jack Reakoff here.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Hey, Jack, good to hear you. Louis Green.

(No comments)

MR. DOOLITTLE: Don't hear Louis.

Mike Kramer, Northwest Arctic.

(No comments)

MR. DOOLITTLE: Don't hear Mike.

Sue Entsminger.

(No comments)

MR. DOOLITTLE: I don't hear Sue.

Gordon Brower.

(No comments)

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay. So we're waiting right now, Mr. Chair, for Charlie to get on line.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right.

Thanks for that roll call, Tom. We'll give him another minute or two before we start.

(Pause)

MR. DOOLITTLE: Katya Wessels, are you on line?

(No comments)

MR. DOOLITTLE: Katya Wessels, are you on line?

(No comments)

MR. DOOLITTLE: Moving to Orville, Orville, are you on line?

MR. LIND: Yes, Tom, can you hear me?

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yep, loud and clear, just checking for people that are involved in each of the proposals to make sure they're here.

MR. LIND: Yeah, Charlie was trying earlier.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yep, I saw that.

Suzanne was on line.

MR. LIND: Okay.

MR. DOOLITTLE: I know she's on deck. I'm just trying to see if Katya's on line yet.

MR. LIND: Okay.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Orville.

(Pause)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Well, we can start and welcome back from lunch everybody and we'll get started with the Staff providing us with the information for the next proposal.

MS. WORKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This is Suzanne Worker. I'll be presenting the
overview of analysis WP20-30.

This proposal begins on Page 891 of your meeting materials and it was submitted by the Alaska Peninsula Becharof National Wildlife Refuges.

WP20-30 requests that the Alaska hare season be shortened from a year-round season to November 1st to January 31st, and that the harvest limit be reduced from no limit to one per day and four annually.

Before we get too far into this there are a couple of things I want to point out about nomenclature. First, the Alaska hare is called the tundra hare in Federal regulations, but Alaska hare is probably the best term. And the second thing is that the Alaska hare or the tundra hare are the same species, but it's a different species than the snowshoe hare despite being lumped together in Federal regulations. So that situation can create a little bit of confusion when we're talking about hares.

Alaska hares are among the most poorly understood game species in Alaska with hunter questionnaires being the only source of information about these populations. Anecdotally, however, abundance is well below historical levels throughout the range of the species. Hares, both snowshoe hares and Alaska hares are used by subsistence users, but, again, we're unable to quantify that. Hunter surveys suggest the hunting pressure on small game in Unit 9 is relatively low compared to areas on the road system, but that hares are targeted less frequently than other small game species like ptarmigan and grouse so the harvest is likely low.

If this proposal is adopted the Alaska hare season would be reduced by 75 percent, though hunters would still have the opportunity to harvest hares during winter when they're out engaging in other subsistence or recreational activities. The change in daily and overall harvest limits may be effective in reducing harvest, which could translate into an improvement in the conservation status of these populations. Any positive effects these changes have on the Alaska hare population would benefit subsistence users in the long term despite the immediate reduction of subsistence opportunity.
The OSM conclusion is to support WP20-30 with modification, to replace the term tundra hare with the term Alaska hare throughout Federal subsistence regulations. This would reflect contemporary nomenclature and reduce regulatory complexity between State and Federal regulations.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions from the Board for Staff.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Appreciate the presentation. We'll go to the summary of public comments, Regional Council Coordinator.

MS. DEATHERAGE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the record this is Karen Deatherage with the Office of Subsistence Management. There were no written public comments for Wildlife Proposal 20-30.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. At this time we will open the floor to the public testimony. Operator, if there's anybody standing by to present, please let them in.

OPERATOR: Thank you. Once, again, if you have a question or a comment, please press star then one.

One moment.

(Pause)

OPERATOR: At this time, Sir, I'm showing no question or comment.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. We'll move to Regional Advisory Council recommendations, Chair or designee.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yes, thank you. For the record, this is Nanci Morris Lyon, Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council. We opposed WP20-30.
The Council opposed the proposal as written, voting one to seven. The season end date appears to be too restrictive and some Council members stated that harvest and population numbers were unknown. Additional information on the species is needed prior to adopting the proposal to set season dates. Traditionally the winter months are when hares are harvested for winter protein.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Are there additional Chairs.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, hearing none. We'll move on to the Tribal/Alaska Native Corporation comments, Native Liaison.

MR. LIND: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, I hear you well.

MR. LIND: Okay, thank you, Federal Subsistence Board members, Mr. Chair, RAC Chairs. My name is Orville Lind, Office of Subsistence Management.

At the time of the consultation session there were no comments made on WP20-30.

That's all I have, Mr. Chair.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments, State Liaison.

MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Chair. For the record, Ben Mulligan, Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

We support this proposal with suggested modification. We recommend this Board consider adding a salvage requirement for all Alaska hares, as was done by the Alaska Board of Game. The salvage requirement
is currently listed as either the hide or meat of the Alaska hare. And also it's not a requirement, it's just something we're asking hunters to do so we can learn more about Alaska hare population as our biologists keep trying to do the same thing, is if they're so inclined to do so, we please ask them to call into our King Salmon office to report hare harvest so we can learn more alongside the folks that are out there hunting alongside with our biologists.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions for the State.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, hearing none. We'll move to InterAgency Staff Committee comments, ISC Chair.

MS. WORKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

It's Suzanne Worker.

The InterAgency Staff Committee agrees with the OSM modification to align Federal and State nomenclature by changing tundra hare references in Federal regulations to Alaska hare, which is used in State regulation. This will reduce regulatory complexity and improve the potential to conserve Alaska hare populations which are reported to be well below historic levels. Aligning Federal and State seasons and harvest limits will further reduce regulatory complexity and improve the ability for populations to recover while still providing some opportunity for harvest.

The Board could consider increasing the season length to provide a subsistence priority, however, usually a solitary animal during late winter, aggregations of 20 or more have been observed with the start of the mating season. More research is needed to understand the status of the species but throughout the hare's southern distribution on the Alaska Peninsula high population numbers have not been reported since winter of 1953/54. Potential limiting factors include habitat loss, harvest and climate change. A conservative approach aligning with State regulations may therefore be warranted to ensure continued
subsistence use of this species into the future.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue.

Any questions for ISC.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any Board
discussion with Council Chairs and State Liaison.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,
I'll open up the floor for Board action.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, Greg
Siekaniec, Fish and Wildlife Service.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have
the floor.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
I'll try and avoid any inferences to the waskly wabbits
here as I go through this.

I would move to adopt Proposal WP20-30
as modified by the Office of Subsistence Management.
The proposed language is shown on Page 897 and 98 of
the Board book. Following a second, I will provide
justification for why I intend to support my motion.

MR. REAM: Park Service seconds.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you. Current
information indicates that the Alaska hares in Unit 9
are at historically low densities compared to the past
and therefore it is appropriate to restrict harvest in
such a situation. Although there is not an abundance
of information on the current population, there is
enough data to indicate that has species are declined
enough to warrant precautionary conservation measures.
Reducing the season from July 10 to June 30th to
November 1 to January 31 reduces the season by 75
percent, yet, continues to offer subsistence users the
opportunity to harvest Alaska hare. Reducing harvest
to one per day, and four annually, will hopefully
reduce overall harvest and promote population recovery.
Collectively these changes offer a balance between implementation of conservation measures and allowing for the continuation of subsistence uses in the near term. Positive effects of these changes on Alaska hare populations will benefit subsistence users in the long term.

Furthermore, the common species, the snowshoe hare, would remain unlimited from July 1 to June 30.

To increase our knowledge of the species I would encourage the Office of Subsistence Management to include language in the regulation book commonly referred to as the Handy Dandy, to encourage voluntary reporting of Alaska hare harvest observations to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game King Salmon Office or report on the website, hare observation so the Department can learn more about harvest and locations of greatest abundance for ongoing research.

Updating the common name from tundra hare to Alaska hare in Federal subsistence regulations will reduce regulatory complexity. Alaska hare terminology will be consistent for State and Federal regulations which would reduce confusion for Federally-qualified subsistence users who hunt under both State and Federal regulations.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Greg. Any Board discussion, questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing no further discussion I'll call for the question.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hello.

MR. SCHMID: Question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: The question's been called. Tom, do you want to do roll call please.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay, Mr. Chair. This
is Proposal WP20-30 to support with modification to replace the term tundra hare with the term Alaska hare throughout Federal subsistence regulation to reflect contemporary nomenclature and reduce regulatory complexity between State and Federal regulations.

The modified regulation should read:

The definitions -- the following definitions apply to all regulations contained in this part, hare or hares collectively refers to all species of hares commonly called rabbits in Alaska and includes snowshoe hare and Alaska hare. And affected units are Units 9 and 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 26. The regulation there would be no limit on snowshoe hares and it would be one Alaska hare per day, four in total.

National Park Service, Joshua Ream.

MR. REAM: The National Park Service supports the motion with the modification for the reasons articulated by the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Casey Burns, Bureau of Land Management.

MR. BURNS: BLM will support with the OSM modifications as described by Fish and Wildlife Service.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Sir.

Bureau of Indian Affairs, Gene Peltola.

MR. PELTOLA: Bureau of Indian Affairs opposes as recommended by the Bristol Bay Council out of the concerns that the season and the end dates appears to be too restrictive.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Gene.

Rhonda Pitka.

MS. PITKA: Oppose in deference to the Regional Advisory Council recommendation that the season is too restrictive.

Thank you.
MR. DOOLITTLE: Is Charlie Brower on line yet.

(No comments)

MR. DOOLITTLE: No Charlie.

Greg Siekaniec.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Tom. I support as modified by the Office of Subsistence Management and for reasons provided in the justification.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Greg.

U.S. Forest Service, David Schmid.

MR. SCHMID: Yeah, I'm going to support WP20-30 with the OSM modification, again, based on the justification provided by the Fish and Wildlife Service.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Chairman Anthony Christianson.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I will oppose in deference to the RAC.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair.

MR. DOOLITTLE: I will call once again to see if Charlie Brower is on.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA has a procedural question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead, Gene.

MR. PELTOLA: As the agency Board members have the ISC member sitting in his or her stead, and vote accordingly, does the same occur with regard to a public member, and if so who is the ISC member with regard to the public members?

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Gene, that's a
question that we don't have a clear answer to yet but I
would hope that Charlie could call in here as soon as
possible so that we could get what his vote is on this
reflected and, if not, maybe we could have somebody
give him a call. I would be willing to take a five
minute recess to do that.

MR. DOOLITTLE: And let me ask for
clarification from Ken Lord on this as well, and,
Orville Lind is the ISC representative, you know, for
the Board members.

MR. LORD: Mr. Chair, this is Ken. In
the far distance past when we only had a Chairman as
public member, the person in Orville's position would
sometimes sit in for the Chair but now we have three
public members, we don't have a process in place for
that to happen, at least not yet.

MR. DOOLITTLE: So is the
recommendation that then if a Board member is absent
that they don't have that recommendation even though
there is a quorum?

MR. LORD: Legally a quorum is all we
need.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Sir.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Ken.

MR. DOOLITTLE: So at this point, Ken,
do we commence with the vote as it stands with the
quorum as.....

OPERATOR: Excuse me, Mr. Brower has
joined you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Ah, great.

MR. C. BROWER: Good afternoon, I
finally got through.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Good Charlie, I'm glad
you're with us. We're on a vote right now with -- on
Alaska hare and I have these votes.

The Park Service is yes.
BLM is yes.

Fish and Wildlife Service is yes.

Forest Service is yes.

Bureau of Indian Affairs is no.

Public Member Pitka is no.

Chairman Christianson is no.

MR. C. BROWER: I would go along with no.

MR. DOOLITTLE: So you're not supporting the modification as presented by Fish and Wildlife Service, correct?

MR. C. BROWER: Yes.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Charlie. It's a four/four tie, that means the motion fails.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, thank you guys for that. We'll move on to the next proposal there, Tom.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yes. The next proposal is actually a wildlife closure review, 20-04/06.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, thank you for that presentation. We'll call on the Staff to present the analysis to us, please.

MS. WORKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Suzanne Worker again. Wildlife Closure Review 20-04/06 begins on Page 904 of your analysis -- I'm sorry, Page 904 of your meeting materials.

This review deals with a Federal public lands closure for caribou in three hunt areas. The portion of Unit 9C that drains into the Naknek River from the north which includes Graveyard Creek and Coffee Creek, Unit 9 remainder, and Unit 9E -- sorry, Unit 9C remainder, and Unit 9E. So this affects both the Mulchatna and the Northern Alaska Peninsula Herds.

These closures have been in place at
least in some form since 1999 and in their current form since 2016 when an .804 analysis was conducted. In 2018 Unit 9C remainder was divided at the Naknek River and a new hunt area was established. So if you have your books there's a map of this on Page 910, and those two northern hunt areas used to be a single hunt area. The Board made this boundary change to bring regulations into align with the current distributions of the Mulchatna and the Northern Alaska Peninsula Herds. So in effect the regulatory emphasis in the new hunt area north of the Naknek River was shifted to the Mulchatna Herd consistent with the population that actually exists in that area. However, a Federal public lands closure was not addressed at that time so we have a closure that, in, at least, some areas, doesn't reflect the conservation needs of the herd that it was intended for.

As far as the Northern Alaska Peninsula Herd goes it pretty much stays south of the Naknek River and it remains a small population. It has shown a growth trend over the past several years and it was estimated to be about 3,600 caribou in 2016 but that's still far below the population objective of 12,000 to 15,000 caribou. Harvest has been allowed under both State and Federal regulations since 2016 and those hunts are managed by quota. And up to this point all reported harvest has been by Federally-qualified subsistence users. So it's good news that the population seems to be doing better in recent years and that it can finally support a harvest for local users again but there's no indication that the Federal public lands closure should be rescinded at this time.

It does seem like the current management approach, which includes the State's Tier II permit and the Federal public lands closure appears to be working okay.

So the OSM recommendation is that no changes be made to the Federal public lands closure south of the Naknek River, so this is Unit 9C remainder and Unit 9E. The area north of the Naknek is currently occupied by the Mulchatna Herd and until recently this population seemed to be doing okay, not great, but okay. It was bouncing around near the lower end of the population objective, which was 30,000 to 80,000 animals. But as you know the 2019 population estimate came in quite low at about 13,500 caribou. So that's
less than half of the low end of the population objectives. There may be some motivation to retain the closure north of the Naknek River on account of that new information but I do want to note that since 2009, which is the first year that the non-resident season was closed, only about 50 caribou have been reported harvested by non-Federally-qualified users each year and only about six percent of those, or about three caribou per year were harvested in Unit 9C. So harvest by nonlocals in Unit 9C is inconsequential really when you consider the total harvest of the Mulchatna Herd.

I also want to point out that this is the only Federal public lands closure within the range of the Mulchatna Herd and like I mentioned earlier, it's a vestige of the pre-2018 hunt area that treated the area north of the Naknek River as part of the Northern Alaska Peninsula Herd range.

So for those reasons the OSM recommends that the closure in the hunt area north of the Naknek be rescinded and that any Federal public land closures for the Mulchatna Caribou Herd be taken up on their own merit.

So to summarize, the closure that -- we recommend that the closure in Units 9C remainder and 9E be retained. But that the closure in the portion of 9C that drains into the Naknek from the north be rescinded.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for the presentation. Any questions for Staff.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, hearing none, appreciate the presentation. Summary of public comment, Regional Council Coordinator.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the Board. For the record this is Katya Wessels with OSM. And we did not receive any written public comments for Wildlife Closure WCR20-04/06.

Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Katya, and welcome back on. We'll open the floor to the public, anyone on line, Operator, who would wish to speak to this.

OPERATOR: Once again, if you have a comment or would like to speak press star then one.

One moment.

(Pause)

OPERATOR: At this time, Sir, I'm showing no callers have joined in.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

Regional Advisory Council recommendation, Chair.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman and Board members. Nanci Morris Lyon, Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council.

Bristol Bay Regional Subsistence Advisory Council supported modification of the closure for WCR20-04/06. The Council supported the OSM conclusion to rescind the Federal public lands closure in the portion of Unit 9C draining into the Naknek River from the north in Graveyard Creek and Coffee Creek, and to retain the Federal public lands closures in Unit 9C remainder and Unit 9E. The Council noted that residents of the area desire additional opportunities to harvest caribou but don't believe that the Northern Alaska Peninsula Herd is ready for additional harvest pressure. The Council agreed with the OSM conclusion that there's no reason to retain the Federal public lands closure north of the Naknek River, the area occupied by the Mulchatna Caribou Herd.

And I will note that we feel pretty strongly about keeping the closure to the south of the river in place, mostly because we have suffered the most for many, many years now, I believe it's over 20 years waiting for this herd to come back after its last fall. So we're really quite protective of the herd and with good justification.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for
that, appreciate it. Any questions from the Board for the Chair.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll move on to tribal, Alaska Native Corporation comments, Native Liaison, Orville Lind.

MR. LIND: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Board members, RAC Chairs, Orville Lind, Native Liaison for the Office of Subsistence Management.

We had two sessions of consultation, one on September 23rd and one on September 30th and there were no comments made to WCR20-04/06.

That's all I have, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Orville. Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments, State Liaison.

MR. BURCH: Mr. Chair, this is Mark Burch with the Department of Fish and Game. The State has no comments on this closure.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Mark. InterAgency Staff Committee comments, ISC Chair.

MS. WORKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's Suzanne Worker. The InterAgency Staff Committee agrees with the OSM conclusion and the Bristol Bay Subsistence Regional Advisory Council recommendation to retain the Federal public lands closure in Unit 9C remainder and 9E. The ISC also agrees with rescinding the Federal public lands closure in the portion of Unit 9C draining into the Naknek River from the north and Graveyard Creek and Coffee Creek on the basis that the original justification for the closure was based on the conservation concerns for the Northern Alaska Peninsula Herd, which no longer ranges within this area. Still, the Board may consider retaining a closure in this area to support the recovery of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd for which there are current conservation concerns. The area compromises only a small portion of the Mulchatna range, and, therefore, a closure may have only limited benefits to the conservation of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd.
Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions for the ISC Staff.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Open it up for Board discussion with Council Chair and State Liaison.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right. Hearing none, Federal Subsistence Board action, the floor is open.

MR. REAM: Mr. Chair, this is Joshua Ream with the National Park Service.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor, Josh.

MR. REAM: I move to modify the closure for Wildlife Closure Review WCR20-04/06 to rescind only that portion of the closure in the portion of 9C draining into the Naknek River from the north and Graveyard Creek and Coffee Creek and to retain the closure within Units 9C remainder and 9E. This mirrors the OSM modification that can be found on Page 904 of the meeting book.

If given a second, I will explain my intention to support this motion.

MR. C. BROWER: Second.

MR. REAM: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You've got the floor, Josh.

MR. REAM: I concur with the Bristol Bay Subsistence Regional Advisory Council, OSM and the InterAgency Staff Committee that the reason for the closure conservation concerns for the Northern Alaska Peninsula Caribou Herd is no longer applicable because the herd no longer ranges within this area. I do, however, recognize the conservation concerns for the Mulchatna Caribou Herd which has limited range within
this area and I anticipate that these concerns are
being addressed through other actions that encompass
the broader range of that herd.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Josh. Any questions, any further Board discussion or
deliberation.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: A call for the
question.

MR. C. BROWER: Question.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Question.

MR. C. BROWER: And ask for unanimous
consent.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hey, Tom, will
you do roll call on this one and if we do get down
there Charlie on the next one we can entertain that
motion, so Tom will you do roll call on this one.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, thank you very
much, Mr. Chair. This is Wildlife Closure Review 20-
04/06 closures to caribou hunting in Unit 9C draining
into the Naknek River from north and Graveyard Creek
and Coffee Creek, Unit 9C remainder and Unit 9E the
closure in the Unit 9C areas are closed to caribou
hunting except by residents of Unit 9C and Egegik, and
the closure in Unit 9E is closed to caribou hunting
except by residents of Unit 9E, Nelson Lagoon and Sand
Point. The particular motion was to support the OSM
conclusion, modified closure to rescind the closure in
the portion of Unit 9C draining into the Naknek River
from north of Graveyard Creek and Coffee Creek and to
maintain the closures within Units 9C and remainder of
9E.

Start off with on the modified OSM
proposal with Bureau of Indian Affairs, Gene Peltola.

MR. PELTOLA: The Bureau of Indian
Affairs supports modifying the existing closure as
recommended by the Bristol Bay RAC.
MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Gene.

U.S. Forest Service, David Schmid.

MR. SCHMID: Yeah, the Forest Service supports the modified -- I'm sorry -- supports to modify to eliminate the closure for WCR20-04/06 in deference to the Advisory Council.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay.

Rhonda Pitka.

MS. PITKA: I support to modify the closure in deference to the Regional Advisory Council as stated on Page 919 of the meeting book.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Rhonda.

Charlie Brower.

MR. C. BROWER: I support to maintain modified closure WCR20-04/06 as stated.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Joshua Ream.

MR. REAM: The National Park Service supports the modified closure in deference to the RAC and for the reasons articulated earlier.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Bureau of Land Management Chad Padgett, or Casey Burns.

MR. PADGETT: I'm back on Tom, this is Chad, and I support in deference to the RAC.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Chad.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Tom. I support modified closure proposal in deference to the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council and as justified by the National Park Service.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Greg. And Chairman Anthony Christianson.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Support in deference to the RAC.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The motion passes unanimously.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: That moves us on, Mr. Chair, to Wildlife Closure Review 20-38.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay.

MS. WORKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Suzanne Worker and I'll be presenting the analysis for WCR20-38, which begins on Page 920 of your meeting material. This one is for moose in Unit 18, the Kuskokwim hunt area, and this closure has been in place in some form since 1991.

The moose population was quite small during the 1990s, which led to a harvest moratorium beginning in 2004. That moratorium was effective in allowing the establishment of a harvestable population and it appears that the population along the Kuskokwim main stem and its tributaries continued to grow. The most recent population survey, which included the main stem river corridor between Kalskag and Kwethluk occurred in 2015. At that time the population was estimated to be nearly 1,400 moose so the population is growing but it remains below the State's population objective of 2,000 moose. Composition estimates along the main stem were last obtained in 2016 and at that time there were an estimated 70 bulls per 100 cows, which is well above the minimum objective of 30 bulls per 100 cows and the calf/cow ratios in 2016 were 56 calves per 100 cows.
Harvest has been allowed in the Kuskokwim hunt area since 2009 by State registration permit. Harvest has increased noticeably since then particularly within the last several years. In 2018 212 moose were reported harvested, nearly all of which were taken by locals. Demand for moose is much greater than that however and this becomes obvious when you consider that 1,300 hunters, on average, obtained moose permits each year with combined State and Federal quota of less than 300 bulls. For the past several years the State managed quota, which applies primarily to lands along the main stem of the Kuskokwim has been met in a week or less. A Federal quota, which appears primarily to lands along the tributaries has remained unmet in recent years but this is likely due to the challenges of hunting in the tributaries rather than to lack of demand for moose.

The OSM conclusion is to retain the Federal public lands closure to maintain the status quo because demand still far outweighs the number of moose available for harvest. Retaining the closure ensures that the 15 communities that have demonstrated the most dependence on this resource continue to have a subsistence priority on Federal public lands.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue. We'll move to -- without any questions from the Board, we'll move to summary of public comment, Regional Council Coordinator.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the Board. For the record, Katya Wessels. We received no written public comments on Wildlife Closure Review WCR20-38.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. We'll open the floor to public testimony, anyone on line.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none we'll move on to Regional Advisory Council recommendation, Chair or designee.
MS. ROGERS: Hello, Mr. Chair, this is Alissa Rogers with the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta Subsistence Regional Advisory Council.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hello, you have the floor.

MS. ROGERS: Thank you, Mr. Chair and Board members. My name is Alissa Nadine Rogers, Madame Chair for the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta Regional Advisory Council. And our comment is that we're just going to maintain status quo.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. We'll call next, any questions for the Chair.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll move on to Tribal/Alaska Native Corporation comments, Native Liaison, Orville Lind.

MR. LIND: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Board members, RAC Chairs. Orville Lind, Native Liaison for the Office of Subsistence Management.

During the consultation session we did not have any comments.

That's all I have, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments, State Liaison.

MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Okay. The Department supports this proposal -- sorry, this is WCR20-38 -- sorry, the Department has no comment on this proposal -- my apologies, Sir.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, thank you. We'll move on to InterAgency Staff Committee comments, ISC Chair.

MS. WORKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The InterAgency Staff Committee provided the standard comment for WCR20-38.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
Board discussion with Council Chair and State Liaison.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, Federal Board action.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, Greg Siekaniec, Fish and Wildlife Service.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor, Greg.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Yes, Mr. Chair. I move to maintain the status quo for Wildlife Closure Review 20-38. The wildlife closure language is shown on Page 922 of the Board book. Following a second I will provide justification for why I intend to support this motion.

MR. C. BROWER: Second.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you. Although it is clear the moose population is increasing, it is uncertain if the population has met the State population objective of 2,000 and its winter conditions in 2020 have negatively affected the overall population. In addition, it is also evident that demand for moose by Federally-qualified users is greater than the harvestable surplus. Until a survey can be completed to determine the status of the population, I support continuing this closure in support of the Yukon Delta Regional Advisory Council request and to ensure a priority for Federally-qualified subsistence users who are most dependent on this resource.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any further Board discussion.

(No comments)

MR. C. BROWER: Question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been called. Roll call, Tom. And, Charlie, I know you recommended we potentially do it different, but we're
trying to maintain the record on the teleconference here and so I think I'm going to continue to do it with a roll call through Tom, just so that we can articulate our positions and create a better record here on the teleconference. So we'll call on Tom for roll call.

MR. C. BROWER: No problem.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So thank you, Charlie.

MR. C. BROWER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, it could have sped it up I would agree with you there, exponentially but I think we need to continue to keep the record, so, Tom, I'll call on you to do roll call.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And thank you to Charlie for raising a way to make things more expedient.

This is Closure Review WCR20-38 closure to moose hunting in a portion of Unit 18 except by the residents of Tuntutuliak, Eek, Napaskiak, Napakiak, Kasigluk, Nunapitchuk, Atmautlauk, Oscarville, Bethel, Kwethluk, Akiachak, Akiak, Tuluksak, Lower Kalskag and Kalskag. This is to maintain the status quo on that particular closure.

We'll start with Gene Peltola, BIA.

MR. PELTOLA: Bureau of Indian Affairs votes to support maintaining the status quo as recommended by the YKDelta RAC.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Gene.

U.S. Forest Service, David Schmid.

(No comments)

MR. DOOLITTLE: U.S. Forest Service, David Schmid or Wayne Owen.

(No comments)

MR. DOOLITTLE: Operator, could we see if Wayne Owen or David Schmid is on line.
OPERATOR: I'm showing David is on line, however -- and his line is open, we're just unable to hear him. Can you please check your mute button, Sir.

(No comments)

OPERATOR: I'm going to go ahead and place Mr. Owen in.....

MR. OWEN: Can you hear me now?

OPERATOR: Mr. Owen, your line is open.

MR. OWEN: Yep, thank you. Tom, sorry, a little phone trouble, this is Wayne Owen, Forest Service. The Forest Service supports.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Wayne.

Bureau of Land Management, Chad Padgett.

MR. PADGETT: Thanks, Tom. I vote to support in deference to the RAC. Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Chad.

Rhonda Pitka.

MS. PITKA: Hi. I vote to support maintaining the closure in deference to the Regional Advisory Council. Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Rhonda.

Charlie Brower.

MR. C. BROWER: I support to maintain status quo for WCR20-38.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Charlie.


MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Tom. I support to maintain the closure in deference to the Yukon Delta Regional Advisory Council and for the
justification provided.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Greg.

National Park Service, Joshua Ream.

MR. REAM: The National Park Service supports maintaining the status quo in deference to the YKDelta RAC. Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Josh.

And Chairman Anthony Christianson.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support in deference to the RAC.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Chairman Christianson. The motion passes unanimously.

That moves us on to, Mr. Chair, Wildlife Closure Review 20-40.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay.

MS. WORKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Suzanne Worker, and I'll be presenting this analysis which begins on Page 932 of your meeting material.

Moose in the portion of Unit 18, south of and including the Kanektok River drainage to the Goodnews River drainage so this includes both the Kanektok and the Arolik River drainages. This closure has been in place since 1991 when all Federal public lands throughout Unit 18 were closed. There hadn't been a Federal season in this hunt area until 2019 and that season was a result of Wildlife Special Action WSA19-01.

Prior to the early 2000s moose were not commonly observed in southern Unit 18 but a population eventually became established there and it started to grow in about 2012. Between 2013 and 2018 the population grew at an estimated 42 percent annually and by 2018 173 moose were observed. Harvest within the Kanektok, Arolik hunt area was allowed under State
regulation by harvest ticket until 2019 when a registration permit became a requirement. Reported harvest is low averaging only four moose per year and Federally-qualified subsistence users are responsible for most of that reported harvest.

You may have noticed that the OSM preliminary conclusion was to modify or eliminate the closure, and that's because opening Federal public lands isn't likely to pose a conservation concern, however, we offered an addendum and changed our conclusion to take no action based on action taken on WP20-32/33. That proposal is on the consensus agenda and assuming you adopt it as recommended by the Regional Advisory Council, the State and the InterAgency Staff Committee, the Federal public lands closure will be rescinded. So, again, that's Proposal WP20-32/33, and our recommendation is to take no action on this closure review.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll go to summary of public comments, Regional Council Coordinator.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the Board. For the record Katya Wessels, OSM. And we did not receive any written public comments on WCR20-40.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. We'll open the floor to the public, anyone on line.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing.....

OPERATOR: I'm not showing anyone at this time, Sir.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
We'll move to the Regional Advisory Council recommendation, Chair or designee.

MS. ROGERS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This is Alissa Rogers with YKDelta RAC.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have the floor.

MS. ROGERS: Thank you. Through the Chair and the Board. My name is Alissa Nadine Rogers, I'm with the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta Subsistence Regional Advisory Council. We would like to support this proposal with modification for closure of WCR20-40 to open Unit 18 south of the Kanektok River to only Federally-qualified subsistence users.

There is evidence and known data that the moose population has been growing, which can support a small subsistence hunt. The subsistence communities in the hunt area should have the first priority to harvest and have it only open to the Federally-qualified users at this time. We had also suggested that there was further consultation with the tribes of Eek, Quinhagak and Goodnews Bay.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions for the Council Chair.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Tribal/Alaska Native Corporation comments, Native Liaison.

MR. LIND: Can you hear me now?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hear you now.

MR. LIND: Okay, thank you. Mr. Chair, Board members, RAC Chairs. During the consultation we did not hear any comments.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments, State Liaison.
MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Sir. For the record, Ben Mulligan, Alaska Department of Fish and Game. And actually we have no comment on this closure. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. We'll move on to the InterAgency Staff Committee comments, ISC Chair.

MS. WORKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The InterAgency Staff Committee offered the standard comment for WCR20-40.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. That opens it up for Board discussion with Council Chair and State Liaison.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll open the floor for Federal Board action on this.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, Greg Siekaniec, Fish and Wildlife Service.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Greg, you have the floor.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair. I move to take no action on Wildlife Closure Review 20-40. The wildlife closure language is shown on Page 993 of the Board book. Following a second I will provide justification for why I intend to support this motion.

MR. C. BROWER: Second.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you. Action taken on Wildlife Proposal WP20-32/33, which is on the consensus agenda, addresses the Federal public lands closure in the Kanektok, Arolik hunt area and will satisfy the requirements of this closure review. That analysis includes a comprehensive overview of all associated regulatory requests and action including feedback from the public, tribes and the Council.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
further discussion or deliberation by the Board.
(No comments)
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: A call for the question.
MR. C. BROWER: Question.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Roll call, Tom.
MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
This is Closure Review WCR20-40 review closure to moose hunting in Unit 18 south and including the Kanektok River drainages to the Goodnews River drainage to all users. The motion was to take no action.
Start with Bureau of Land Management, Chad Padgett.
MR. PADGETT: I support the motion to take no action.
MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Chad.
National Park Service, Joshua Ream.
MR. REAM: The National Park Service also supports taking no action on this. Thank you.
MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you.
U.S. Forest Service, David Schmid, or Wayne Owen.
MR. OWEN: The U.S. Forest Service supports the motion to take no action on WCR20-40. Thank you.
MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Wayne.
Bureau of Indian Affairs, Gene Peltola.
MR. PELTOLA: The Bureau of Indian Affairs also supports taking no action on WCR20-40.
MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Gene.
Rhonda Pitka.
MS. PITKA: I support taking no action on WCR20-40 because it will be addressed in a different proposal. Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Rhonda.

Charlie Brower.

MR. C. BROWER: I support to take no action on WCR20-40.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Charlie.


MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Tom. I support to take no action in deference to the Yukon Delta Regional Advisory Council, which will be addressed through Wildlife Proposal WP20-32/33, which is on the consensus agenda.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you much, Greg.

And Chairman Anthony Christianson.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support no action.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Motion to take no action passes unanimously.

That will move us, Mr. Chair, to the Western Interior proposals, starting with Wildlife Proposal 20-36/37.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And we'll call on the Staff to present that, thank you.

MS. MAAS: All right, thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the Board. My name is Lisa Maas and I'm a wildlife biologist in the Office of Subsistence Management. I'll be presenting a summary of the analysis for Wildlife Proposal WP20-36/37 which begins on Page 940 of your meeting book.

Wildlife Proposal WP20-36 was submitted.
by the Koyukuk/Nowitna/Innoko National Wildlife Refuge
and requests establishing a 15 day March new season in
a portion of Unit 21D resulting in a creation of a new
hunt area, eliminating the March to be announced new
season in Unit 21D remainder, requiring a State
registration permit in the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area,
or Koyukuk CUA, and eliminating the March and April to
be announced new seasons in the Koyukuk CUA.

Wildlife Proposal WP20-37 was submitted
by the Western Interior Council and requests
establishing a 15 day to be announced new season
between December 1st and 31st and a 15 day may be
announced season between March 1st and 31st in a
portion of Unit 21D resulting in the creation of a new
hunt area. The March season would be announced if the
harvest quota is not met during the December hunt.

The Refuge's overall intent is to align
State and Federal regulations in Unit 21D due to the
complexity of land ownership in this subunit, which
makes it very difficult for users to know if they're on
Federal or non-Federal land.

The Western Interior Council proposes
establishing a December season in a portion of Unit 21D
as harvesting a moose then would provide valuable meat
over the winter. If quotas are not met in December the
Council proposes opening another season in March.

Federal new seasons in Unit 21D have
changed numerous times since 1990 in response to moose
abundance and to changes in State regulations. Given
the checkerboard pattern of land ownership in this
subunit alignment with State regulations is usually the
impetus for modifying Federal regulations. In 2019 the
Alaska Board of Game established a 15 day winter moose
season in Unit 21D, that portion south of the south
bank of the Yukon River down stream of the up river
entrance of Kala Slough and west of Kala Creek. This
hunt area is depicted in Map 1 on Page 943 of your
meeting book and I will hereafter refer to this hunt
area as Unit 21D southwest.

The Western Interior Council submitted
Proposal 59 to the State Board of Game which is
identical to Proposal WP20-37, the Alaska Board of Game
considered Proposal 59 at their March 2020 meeting and
the proposal failed.
Moose in Unit 21D are surveyed in three distinct areas as shown in Map 1 on Page 943. The middle Koyukuk survey area is located within Koyukuk CUA hunt area. Surveys indicate the moose population in this area is stable or declining and low bull/cow ratios do not support increased harvest opportunity. The lower Koyukuk Yukon survey area straddles all three hunt areas, while high calf/cow ratios indicate this population is growing, very low bull/cow ratios recommend conservative bull harvest. Indeed 2017 bull/cow ratios in a portion of this survey area were only 10 bulls per 100 cows. The Kaiyuh Slough survey area is located within the State's new hunt area of Unit 21D southwest. High bull/cow and calf/cow ratios in recent years coupled with substantial increases in densities support additional harvest in this area. Indeed this recent and substantial increase in population is what prompted the State to establish the March to be announced season in 2019 to slow but not stop population growth. ADF&G announces a quota for this hunt each year, which is 0.9 percent of the estimated number of cows. Between 1990 and 2018 reported moose harvest in Unit 21D averaged 300 moose per year although ADF&G estimates unreported harvest as an additional 125 moose per year. Federally-qualified subsistence users account for about half of the reported moose harvest in Unit 21D on average.

One alternative considered was establishing a cow only December hunt. This would accommodate the Council's desire for harvest opportunity in December, as well as addressing conservation concerns associated with harvesting additional bulls in December.

Adopting Proposal WP20-36 would align Federal and State regulations, eliminating Federal only seasons where moose populations do not support additional harvest and establishing a March to be announced season in Unit 21D southwest where moose populations are growing.

The intent of the March season is to provide additional harvest opportunity and to slow but not stop the growth of the Kaiyuh Flats moose population.

Adopting Proposal WP20-37 establishes a 15 day season in December in Unit 21D southwest,
however, conservation concerns exist for a December
hunt due to very low bull/cow ratios in portions of the
hunt area. As bulls still have antlers in December,
people may target bulls when the intent of the winter
season is to harvest cows as the moose population is
growing but cannot support additional bull harvest in
some areas. Adoption of Proposal WP20-37 would also
misalign State and Federal regulations since the Board
of Game failed Proposal 59. Misalignment of State and
Federal regulations in Unit 21D has generally been
avoided due to the complex checkerboard of Federal and
non-Federal lands which causes user confusion and law
enforcement concerns.

The OSM conclusion is to support WP20-
36 with modification to clarify regulatory language and
to delegate authority to the Koyukuk/Nowitna/Innoko
Refuge Manager to announce season dates, harvest quotas
and sex restrictions via delegation of authority only
and take no action on WP20-37.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
questions from the Board for Staff.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for
that presentation. We'll move on to summary of public
comment, Regional Council Coordinator, Katya.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chair,
members of the Board. We received no written public
comments on WP20-36/37.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
We'll move on to open the floor to public testimony,
anyone on the line.

OPERATOR: I'm showing that we have one
question -- or one comment from Arnold Demenski [sic],
your line is now open.

MR. DEMOSKI: I gave my testimony this
morning, I don't know if you need me to repeat it or
just simply support/oppose.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor, Arnold, so if you just wanted to -- you have the time to speak to it.

MR. DEMOSKI: Okay. Thank you for the opportunity to speak again. I just wanted to say I do support WP20-36, having that opportunity at that time is ideal for people in Nulato and Kaltag considering we do have the ceremonial Stick Dance Celebration right after that hunt. So having our population in the village is doubled, sometimes tripled in size, so it's really ideal for us to have that. I mean we get the ceremonial moose but that's not quite enough to feed everybody because our population is so big at those times. So having that hunt then in March, that's really good for us and I support that.

For WP20-37, I oppose -- I know -- I talked to some of the proponents that submitted that proposal and I know what he's trying to do but at this time I'm going to have to oppose that. If we do meet our harvest quota in December we wouldn't have that opportunity in March, so I oppose WP20-37. It's good to see the numbers rising every year, though, in our area, hopefully it continues to do that.

Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. I appreciate the time.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for taking the time to call in Arnold. Any questions for Arnold.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, hearing none, appreciate it, I hope you have a good day.

Regional Advisory Council recommendations, Chair or designee.

MR. REAKOFF: This is Jack Reakoff, can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I could hear you, Jack, you have the floor.

MR. REAKOFF: Okay. The Council
unanimously supported WP20-37 with modification to
define the December hunt area for Unit 21 is -- the
area southeast of Kala Slough and Ninemile Camp, but
Anvik Creek drainage in the Kaiyuh Mouth and south to
the Unit 21D boundary. The Council discussed the low
bull/cow ratio near Galena of 10 bulls per 100 cows,
and wanted to ensure that that area that's included in
the spring hunt is not included in the December hunt.
The modified hunt area would allow for harvest of a
high density moose area with good bull/cow ratios while
applying conservation measures where needed. The
Council also requested that a modification to WP20-37
be submitted to the Alaska Board of Game to modify the
Council's Board of Game Proposal 59. This should be
done to align the Federal and State regulations so the
modification cited above and adopted by the Council at
the October 8 and 9 2019 meeting we had in Galena -- or
correction, in McGrath.

The Council believes aligning both
State and Federal regulations will further conserve the
moose population in low density areas of 21D while
providing subsistence opportunities in areas of high
density moose population. The Council intend also to
provide moose harvest opportunity early in the winter
within the described new hunt area of 21D both under
State and Federal regulations. That was our intention.

It is the desire of the Council to add
a disparate Federal hunt -- it's not the Council's
intention to have a disparate Federal hunt, therefore,
if the Board of Game fails to adopt Proposal 59 as
amended, then the Council will withdraw the December
hunt portion of WP20-37 from Board consideration.

The Council opposed -- at the time,
this is in October when we had our meeting, the WP20-36
because of its action taken on WP20-37, however, the
Chair stated that he does not support eliminating the
Federal only hunt in 21 as opposed in 20-36 noting that
while moose populations may not support an additional
season right now, those seasons should be kept in
regulation to provide subsistence harvest opportunity
when the moose population increases.

At our winter, 2020 meeting, the
Council clarified that they do not support requiring
the State registration permit in the Koyukuk Controlled
Use Area as proposed in 20-36, the Council they do --
we do support that permit. The Council also supported modifying language in the December hunt as that portion of Unit 21D southeast of Yukon River and south of and including the Kaiyuh Slough and Gordon Creek drainages. The regulation is stated and in the map that Lisa referred to. The reason we wanted a December portion -- December 1 to December 31 was that the -- one of our members felt that there was -- if a somebody -- a family didn't get a moose in the fall hunt, that at the soonest opportunity to cross the Yukon River should be afforded so that people from Koyukuk and Nulato, primarily, and Kaltag, could enter into the Kaiyuh Flats which is across the river from those communities. The moose population has increased from nearly 2,000 moose to 4,000 moose and the bull/cow ratio in our described area is very high for bulls. We were eliminating the area near Galena, the northeast portion of that winter hunt, the State has, because of the low bull/cow ratio. We were addressing those issues.

But the Board of Game did not adopt. The Board listened to testimony that the river would be dangerous from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. I think our residents in our communities know how to cross the Yukon River. And I took offense that our community members would be jeopardized by having a hunt concurrent with the Federal hunt, I took exception to that. I've crossed rivers, large drainages, on ice pans, one day after the ice, if you know how to do it you can do it and if somebody didn't get a moose they should have been afforded the opportunity, but that didn't happen. I talked to the Subsistence Coordinator for Koyukuk/Nowitna/Innoko, there was only eight moose taken in the spring hunt this year in the State so the quota was 25 moose and so the harvest opportunity is still maintained in March but the quota is not even being taken. Our Council felt that people should have opportunity -- or should be able to take moose in December, and, of course, we don't have idiots for hunters, they're not going to go across the river and shoot a bull moose that's all skinny when they can take cows in the described area in December. But the State didn't adopt our regulation. So we defaulted to the spring hunt.

But I want the Board to be aware that there is a special action request to take moose right now so this Coronavirus thing was not anticipated, so I wanted the Board to be aware that there were several
reasons why our Council felt that there needed to be additional harvest opportunity in December and that is primarily because the quotas aren't even being met in March, not like every last moose was taken in March, and if moose are allowed to be taken, any moose, in December, then the hunters will, of course, take a cow or a yearling bull at the most. They're not going to go shoot a skinny bull that's all beat up in December, nobody else is either.

So that would be my statement, Mr. Chairman, thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Jack. Any questions for Jack.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead, Gene, you have the floor.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you. So, Jack, looking at the OSM conclusion, the ISC comment, those come in direct conflict with the Western Interior Council's recommendation and also do you think the Western Interior RAC would best be served by maintaining both of these proposals to be taken as a group or do you think they should at it independently?

Thank you.

MR. REAKOFF: At this point with the Board action, the Board of Game action taken, I would not want to have a disparate December season until we can get the State to come around to that December, and that's reflected in our record, that we did not want to have disparate seasons on the Federal land in December. But I do feel that we should maintain the hunt opportunities because we're going to get special action requests, and there are special action requests, to have hunting opportunity on Federal public land in the described area. And so those hunts need to be on the books. I don't have any problem with Proposal 36 to delegate authority to the in-season manager to the Koyukuk/Nowitna/Innoko Refuge Manager as he is right now, in consultation with the Council. I do feel that we're in a grey zone right now with harvest opportunity for subsistence and I want to reiterate that the herd that we're describing has doubled in population and has
a very high bull/cow ratio and it's in the lower portion of the Kaiyuh Flats there, and that the -- there's opportunity for harvest because they didn't even take the quota this year, it was only eight moose taken, only took a third of the quota.

Does that answer your question, Gene?

MR. PELTOLA: I think it gets us closer and I'm going to have to confer with my ISC members before we actually cast a vote on this one. Thank you, Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: Thank you.

MS. MAAS: Yeah, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

MS. MAAS: Yeah, this is Lisa, for the record and I'd just like to clarify a little bit for Gene's question. And given the Board of Game's action on Proposal 59 and the clarification by the Western Interior Council that they do support the State registration permit as proposed in WP20-36 at their winter meeting. The only difference between the OSM conclusion and the Western Interior RAC's recommendation is OSM recommendation eliminates those to be announced season in Unit 21D remainder in the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area, whereas the Western Interior Council opposed eliminating those hunts, they wanted to maintain those to be announced hunts. So that's the only difference right now between the OSM conclusion and the Western Interior Council's recommendation.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, thank you. Hearing none, I think we were on Regional Advisory Council recommendation, Chair or designee; thank you for that Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And thank you
for the clarification there. We'll move on to Tribal/Alaska Native Corporation comments, Native Liaison.

MR. LIND: Thank you, Mr. Chair. During the consultation session there was nothing said on WP20-36. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Orville. And we'll move on to Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments, State Liaison.

MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Ben Mulligan, Alaska Department of Fish and Game. ADF&G supports WP20-36 as originally submitted by the Refuge to adopt the seasons and bag limits adopted by the Board of Game, which included discontinuing the March 1 season in Unit 21D outside of the RM831 hunt area. That season has not been open for many years and the moose population, even though it can no longer support that hunt.

We do not support Proposal WP20-37 that would create a December season because currently there is no coinciding State hunt during that hunt period and that would have the potential to create confusion for hunters. This is an especially important concern because of the checkerboard pattern of State and Federal managed lands in that area.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, thank you for that. Any questions for the State.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, InterAgency Staff Committee comments, ISC Chair.

MS. WORKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair, this is Suzanne Worker. The InterAgency Staff Committee provided the standard comment for WP20-36/37.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

That opens up the floor for Board discussion with Council Chairs and State Liaison.
MR. C. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead, Charlie.

MR. C. BROWER: You're calling on who now?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We're just getting ready to do Board discussion on this with all the Council Chairs and State Liaison, and the next thing, Charlie, would be to take Federal Board action.

MR. C. BROWER: Okay, I'll wait.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing no further discussion we'll go ahead and open the floor for Federal Board action on this proposal.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair.

MR. C. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead, I'll recognize Charlie.

MR. C. BROWER: Okay. Before we make a motion I want to understand something. Here we are a stalemate where OSM is in support of 36 and not too much of 37, the State is the same way, but then we have the people that live within that area that knows more about the surrounding and the environment and the animals, have a proposal to go their way, and I think -- I don't know, it seems like a stalemate here somewhere down the line, but I'll wait for some other comments from the other Board members.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead, Gene.

MR. PELTOLA: So since we haven't entertained a motion yet, so that means we haven't gone to the next phase, could have brought it up a little
bit earlier, but with the clarification coming from OSM, that the difference between the OSM recommendation and that which is desired by the Western Interior Council, is that, the OSM recommendation does not maintain the to be announced season, which I heard earlier that are a significant part, at least, of what was provided by the Chair of Western Interior, if a motion was being made to -- if a motion is made that does not include those TBA's, if a modification motion is made to include those, what are the Board members thoughts on that, in addition to the Western Interior Chair's thoughts.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: The floor is open for discussion at this point.

MR. SIEKANIEC: So Gene, your -- I'm sorry, Mr. Chair, this is Greg.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Greg, you have the floor, yeah, sorry, I was going to recognize you next.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thanks. So, Gene, your question is if we were to retain the December hunt, even though they're perhaps not ever been used, just to keep them on the record, is that what we were hearing from Jack as well, the Interior Regional Advisory Council?

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair. Yes, Greg. I do recall Jack Reakoff saying that they would like to maintain the option of those winter hunts. I understand the OSM recommendation does not include those winter hunts. If there's a way to structure a motion to have the TBAs be inclusive rather than not. That's what I was asking about, what was Jack's feelings, and by looking at the schedule, you will probably make the motion on this, correct, so your thoughts.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Right.

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead, Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: Clarify the TBAs seasons,
that Koyukuk/Nowitna wants to get rid of, one is for
21B in the Nowitna Refuge, and that's a December 1 to
March 31 to be announced hunt; the other is a March 1
to March 5 hunt up by Huslia in the Koyukuk Controlled
Use Area. And the only reason that we haven't executed
the 21D Controlled Use Area one is because we've had
really deep snow and our cow numbers have declined and
we're just waiting for a turnaround. We do not want to
lose those hunts. Those hunts were hard fought
proposals before the Federal Subsistence Board and we
don't want to eliminate them. They consult with the
Council Chair, and we have had a few of those hunts
previously and we typically get like three to four or
five moose taken, and people like that hunt and we want
to maintain those hunts. We don't want to lose those
in Proposal 36.

Thank you.

MR. PELTOLA: And, Jack, BIA, thank you
for that clarification, that's what we thought your
statements were. Thank you.

MS. MAAS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, is that
you, Lisa?

MS. MAAS: Yeah. So I'd just like to
clarify a little further. Jack mentioned a hunt in the
Nowitna Refuge, that's in Unit 21B, as in 21B Bravo,
only hunts in this proposal being considered are in 21D
Delta, so that Nowitna Refuge hunt is still on the
books, not going to change. The ones that WP20-36
eliminated that is in the OSM conclusion are the March
1 to March 5 hunt in the Koyukuk CUA and the April 10th
to April 15th hunt in the Koyukuk CUA and then the
March 1 to 5 hunt in Unit 21D remainder. So those are
the to be announced seasons that are in question here.

MR. REAKOFF: Thank you, Lisa. I
appreciate your clarification. I was looking at the
wrong one there on 21B.

We still are at the point where we
don't want to lose that Koyukuk Controlled Use -- we
don't want to throw the baby out with bathwater with
Proposal 36.
MR. DOOLITTLE: So, Jack, this is Tom, so if I'm clarifying this, I'm just trying to keep track of where we're at. If we look at the present Federal regulations we have 21D Koyukuk Controlled Use Area, one bull by State registration permit, September 1 through 25, and also on March 1 through 5 season to be announced; you would want to maintain that, correct?

MR. REAKOFF: Correct.

MR. DOOLITTLE: And then we have the Unit 21D that's the proposal, the old regulation was one antlered bull by Federal permit if there is no March 1 through 5 season and if authorized, you know, by announcement of the Koyukuk/Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge manager and it goes on, but that season was an April 10 through 15 season to be announced. Is that one that would be struck?

MR. REAKOFF: We could strike that one, that would be in the now new State hunt area which is typically executed from March 1 to March 15th, if I recall correctly.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay.

MR. REAKOFF: We don't want to lose the Koyukuk Controlled Use hunts, March 1 to March 5.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay. And then the other ones I see, that the new part is, Unit 21D, that portion south of the bank of the Yukon down stream and it goes on, you know, it includes Kala Slough and Kala Creek, and then we talk about the Refuge Manager in the new process would be August 22 through 31, September 5 through 25, and then March to be announced 15 day season.

MR. REAKOFF: Correct.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay. And sorry to belabor that. And then again we have Unit 21D remainder, one moose, however, an antlerless moose may be taken only during September 1 through 21, and if authorized, you know, by the Koyukuk/Nowitna manager and what I saw struck from that, also, was the March 1 through 5 season, do you want the March 1 through 5 season struck from that Unit 21D remainder?
MR. REAKOFF: I think so. I would have to look at -- see it on the map. But that would -- if it's concurrent with that State March 1 to March 15, then we could eliminate the March 1 to March 5 component.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay. So, yep, so I'm just going to go through each one quick here.

And then we have the Koyukuk 21D moose Controlled Use Area again to be announced, that would stay the same, and, again, the April 10 through 15 would be announced.

So that was the main thing, it sounds like it really is about the first part of the proposed Federal regulations was that the Koyukuk Controlled Area of one bull by State registration permit, one antlerless moose by Federal permit, if authorized by announcement of the Koyukuk/Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge Manager, harvest of cow moose accompanied by calves is prohibited, a harvestable surplus of cows will be determined for quota, that the addition, you want to maintain the March 1 through 5 season; correct?

MR. REAKOFF: Correct.


MR. PELTOLA: So, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead, Gene.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you to OSM for clarification for that. And if a motion would address those concerns as gone through with the Western Interior Chair, BIA would be supportive of it.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, this is Greg with Fish and Wildlife Service.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Greg, you have the floor.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Yeah, Mr. Chair, I would like to ask if we could perhaps table this right now while we reconstruct a motion.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, I think
there's nothing that prevents us from holding the vote until we construct a new motion. I don't know if you guys want to take a few minute break or move on to the next proposal.

MS. PITKA: This is Rhonda Pitka, I think we could move on to the next proposal, and come back to this.

MR. SIEKANIEC: This is Greg. I would agree with that, I think we need some time to probably reconstruct this motion.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay.

MR. SIEKANIEC: And our ISC team member will need to be in contact with the ISC, OSM Staff.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. Well, why don't we, just with the concurrence of the Board, and not hearing any opposition, let's table the vote on this motion so we can construct the appropriate language to make sure that we reflect what's intended to support our Regional Advisory Council's recommendations. I see no problem with that if I hear no opposition to that. Let's just hold this vote until we get a motion that we can bring back to the table and we'll entertain the motion either later today or when you guys can do that.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I still like your idea of maybe a five minute break though.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, I think we need to take a few minute break here. Let's take a 10 minute break and we'll come back.

Please stay on the line. Please.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Yep, thank you, Mr. Chair.

(Off record)

(On record)
MR. SCHMID: Hey, Tom, I'm back on here,

this is Dave.

MR. PADGETT: Chad's here.

MS. PITKA: Hi, this is Rhonda.

MR. PELTOLA: BIA's on.

MR. C. BROWER: Charlie's here.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Hey, Charlie.

MR. SCHMID: Dave's here.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Dave.

MR. REAM: National Park Service is here.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Hey, Josh.

I heard Charlie, I heard Rhonda, you're back in, right.

MS. PITKA: I'm here.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Hey, Rhonda. It looks like we have the full Board back, you're back with us Greg.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Yes, Greg is here.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Good. Tony, it looks like we have everybody.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Right on, that was quick this time, that was a good break, thank you guys for being expedient. I know this is all challenging to us. So we'll go ahead and move on to the next proposal.

MR. C. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

MR. DOOLITTLE: The next proposal will be.....
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: One second,
Tom, Charlie has a question.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Oh, okay, sorry.

MR. C. BROWER: Can I be excused for
about a half hour, I got to go check on my guys, the
ice cracked behind them while they were breaking trail
so I just want to go find out some information real
quick.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Charlie.
Thank you for letting us know that you got to step
away, appreciate you informing us and good luck and
safety to your men.

MR. C. BROWER: I'm -- yeah, okay, I'll
call back.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, thank
you, Charlie.

MR. C. BROWER: Thanks.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, Tom,
the floor is yours.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay. What we'll be
doing is moving forward, Mr. Chair with Wildlife
Closure Review 20-20. Also when we come back, you
know, to Wildlife Proposal 36-37, I've been reminded by
my Robert's Rule folks to make sure that we'll need a
full motion on that and -- but I wrote them back that
we hadn't even made it to that stage, we were still
just coming out of Board discussion.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, that's
appropriate here so thank you for that.

MS. WORKER: Mr. Chair, can I just
clarify this point of order. It would actually be best
to have the motion to table 20-36/37 before we move on.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I thought we
almost made that motion with Greg, and concurrence of
the Board, but if we need to make a motion to table to
a time later in the meeting, I guess we can do that for
order of process.
MR. DOOLITTLE: Sure, we can do that right now very quickly.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead, Greg.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Yeah, I move that we table Proposal WP20-36/37 until a later time in our agenda.

MR. PELTOLA: Second.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any opposition to the motion to table it until a later time in our agenda.

(No opposition)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing no opposition to the motion, we'll table it to a later time. Thank you for that point of order and clarification.

Okay, Tom, we'll move on to the next one now, thank you, and we'll call on the Staff right after.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay, thank you, Mr. Chair.

MS. MAAS: Okay, thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. For the record my name is Lisa Maas and I'll be presenting a summary of the analysis for Closure Review WCR20-20 which begins on Page 979 of your meeting book.

Wildlife Closure Review 20-20 pertains to the closure of moose hunting in the Kanuti Controlled Use Area in Unit 24 to non-Federally-qualified users. The closure area is depicted on Map 1 on Page 980. The Kanuti Controlled Use Area is closed to aircraft for moose hunting purposes under both State and Federal regulations. The Board closed the Kanuti CUA to moose hunting by non-Federally-qualified users in 1992 because subsistence needs were not being met.
and because harvest met or exceeded the harvestable surplus.

At their March 2020 meeting, the Alaska Board of Game adopted Proposal 61, which extended the closing date of the resident moose season in the Kanuti CUA by five days from September 25th to October 1st and aligned State and Federal moose seasons. Since 1999 the moose population within the Kanuti CUA has appeared stable. Between 1999 and 2017, densities ranged from .2 to .48 moose per square mile, which is typical for Interior Alaska moose populations that are limited by predation. Bull/cow ratios have been consistently high ranging from 51 to 75 bulls per 100 cows indicating bulls are not being overharvested. Since 2004 calf/cow ratios have exceeded 30 calves per 100 cows suggesting adequate productivity for population growth.

The Koyukuk River Moose Management Plan prescribes a conservative harvest rate of five percent for the Kanuti CUA moose population. This translates to an estimated 65 moose based on the 2017 population estimate. Since Federal lands within the Kanuti CUA are closed to non-Federally-qualified hunters, all harvest is by Federally-qualified subsistence users mostly by residents of Allakaket, Alatna, Bettles and Evansville, however, before the closure in 1992 local residents still accounted for the majority of moose harvest in the Kanuti CUA due to the aircraft restrictions. Between 2006 and 2017 moose harvest by Federal registration permit in Unit 24B ranged from zero to 5 moose per year. Over the same period and area, reported moose harvest under State regulations averaged 35 moose per year. However, unreported harvest in Unit 24 is significant. Between 1997 and 2002 unreported harvest rates for Unit 24 residents were estimated at 76 percent. At the Western Interior Council meeting members testified that subsistence needs in Allakaket and Alatna were not being met, and that deep snow during the winter of 2018/2019 likely negatively impacted the moose population resulting in little recruitment that year.

OSM's recommendation is to maintain the status quo because subsistence needs are not being met indicating this closure is still warranted for the continuation of subsistence uses.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for that presentation. Any questions for the Staff.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll call on the summary of public comment from Regional Council Coordinator.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. Katya Wessels OSM. We received no written public comments for WCR20-20.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Is there anyone on line, the floor is open for public testimony.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll go to Regional Advisory Council recommendation, Chair or designee.

MR. REAKOFF: The Western Interior Regional Council voted unanimously to support continuing the closure for moose in Unit 24 within the Kanuti Controlled Use Area. 2017/18 were deep snow year, not as bad as 2018/19, '18 and '19 we had five feet of now from Coldfoot, just at the bottom edge of the mountains all the way to Allakaket. When I hunted moose last fall I -- my perception was that there was a 40 percent decline in the moose population, there's not been a survey, snow conditions were incorrect to get a survey, weather conditions and so forth, and so there's no current data. Again, 2019/20 we had four feet of snow by Coldfoot, that went all the way down to Allakaket again for the Kanuti Controlled Use Area, again, a bad winter. So the Western Interior Council has proposed a season alignment with the Federal hunt that we have in the Kanuti Controlled Use Area and we're -- through the Board of Game, aligning now, a season closure for bull moose will close on October 1 concurrent with the Federal hunts that we've had for a few years now. So people are not -- climate change causes moose to move later in the season and hunting opportunities of encountering moose right up until the last part of September are minimal and so we have the
season extension, we have a declining moose population and we need to maintain that Federal priority.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Jack. Any questions for Jack.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, Tribal/Alaska Native Corporation comments, Native Liaison.

MR. LIND: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Orville Lind, Native Liaison for Office of Subsistence Management. During the consultation session there was no comments made on WCR20-20.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Orville. We’ll move on to Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments, State Liaison.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Operator, is the State available.

MR. MULLIGAN: Yes, Sir, sorry about that. We do not have any comment for this closure review.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, thank you for that. We will move on to InterAgency Staff Committee comment, ISC Chair.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Again, is that Suzanne, ISC Committee comments, ISC Chair.

MS. WORKER: Sorry about that, am I with you now?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you are, thank you.
MS. WORKER: The InterAgency Staff Committee provided the standard comment for WCR20-20. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. We'll move on to any Board discussion with Council Chair and State Liaison.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll open up the floor for Federal Board action on this.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, Greg, with the Fish and Wildlife Service.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor, Greg.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I move to maintain the status quo for Wildlife Closure 20-20. The wildlife closure language is shown on Page 981 of the Board book. Following a second I will provide justification for why I intend to support my motion.

MR. PELTOLA: Second.

MS. PITKA: This is Rhonda Pitka, I second.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you. Review of the biological data does not appear to indicate a conservation concern for this population, however, the Western Interior Regional Advisory Council indicates that subsistence users most dependent on these animals are unable to meet their subsistence needs. There has been concern expressed that 2018 and 2019 winters have had substantial snows that may have caused this population to decline since the last survey in 2017. The population objective for Unit 24B of 4,000 animals has not been achieved and is currently below the State's objective. As indicated by the harvest records, much of the harvest may go unreported, and, thus, the actual subsistence needs are unknown. Until a more recent population survey can be completed it is appropriate to support the Western Interior Regional Advisory concern and continue this closure to ensure
that subsistence needs are being met.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any additional Board comment or discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: A call for the question.

MS. PITKA: Question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been called. Thank you, Rhonda, appreciate that. Tom, roll call.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This is for the closure review 20-20 review to closure to moose hunting in the Kanuti Controlled Use Area of Unit 24B except by Federally-qualified users and it's to support the OSM conclusion and the Western Interior Regional Advisory Council's recommendation to maintain the status quo.

Rhonda Pitka.

MS. PITKA: I support maintaining the status quo for WCR20-20 and in deference to the Western Interior Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council recommendation. And I share their concerns about the harvest not achieving the needs for subsistence.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Rhonda.

Bureau of Indian Affairs, Gene Peltola.

MR. PELTOLA: Bureau of Indian Affairs supports maintaining the status quo as recommended by the Western Interior Council and identified in WCR20-20.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Gene.

U.S. Forest Service, Wayne Owen.
MR. SCHMID: Dave's back on.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Hi Dave.

MR. SCHMID: Yeah, so the Forest Service supports maintaining the status quo for WCR20-20 in deference to the Western Interior Advisory Council.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Dave.

Bureau of Land Management, Chad Padgett.

MR. PADGETT: I support in deference to the RAC.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Chad.

National Park Service, Josh Ream.

MR. REAM: The National Park Service votes to maintain the status quo and in deference to the Western Interior Regional Advisory Council.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Josh.


MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Tom. The Fish and Wildlife Service supports maintaining the status quo for WCR 20-20 in deference to Western Interior Regional Advisory Council.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: I presuming that Charlie's still out in the field checking on his guys, so I'll move to Chairman Anthony Christianson.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support in deference to the RAC. Thank you, Tom.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you much, Tony.

Motion passes.

Mr. Chair, that moves us to Wildlife

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll call on Staff to present the analysis, thank you.

MS. MAAS: All right, thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the Board. Lisa Maas for the record. I'll be presenting a summary for the analysis for Closure Review WCR20-39, which begins on Page 993 of your meeting book.

Wildlife Closure Review 20-39 pertains to the closure of moose hunting in the eastern portion of Unit 19A to all users. The closure area is depicted in Map 1 on Page 995. Unit 19A, north of the Kuskokwim River up stream from but excluding the George River drainage and south of the Kuskokwim River up stream from and including the Downey Creek drainage, not including the Lime Village Management Area, which, hereafter, will be referred to Unit 19A east was closed under State regulations in 2006 and under Federal regulations in 2007 because of conservation concerns including low productivity, low bull/cow ratios and high hunting pressure.

In March 2019 the Alaska Board of Game adopted Proposal 127 as amended by the Stony/Holitna AC to open a Tier I registration hunt for moose in Unit 19A east. The hunt is very conservative with a five day season and permits only available in Sleetmute and Stony River on a first come, first serve basis. The number of permits will be announced annually. Since 2008 the Unit 19A east moose population has appeared relatively stable but has remained well below management objectives. The State has conducted wolf control in Unit 19A east since 2006 and in 2013 and 2014 the State removed bears from 14 percent of Unit 19A east. While moose densities within the bear control area are above State management objectives, moose densities in the remainder of Unit 19A east are well below objectives. Bull/cow ratios are adequate and have exceeded 30 bulls per 100 cows since 2007. No legal moose harvest occurred in Unit 19A east between 2006 and 2018 when the area was closed under State and Federal regulations. In 2019 the State opened a limited hunt, 30 permits were issued and eight moose were harvested.

OSM's recommendation is to eliminate
the closure in Unit 19A east to mirror the recently adopted State regulations. Establishing a Federal season provides more harvest opportunity to Federally-qualified subsistence users and prevent Federal regulations from being more restrictive than State regulations. Also the new hunt is extremely conservative with a short season and a limited number of permits. Additionally, the Unit 19A east moose population can sustain a limited bull harvest due to a sufficient number of large bulls and high bull/cow ratios.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for that presentation. Any questions for Staff.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll move on to summary of public comment, Regional Council Coordinator.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. Katya Wessels with the Office of Subsistence Management. We received no written public comments for WCR20-39.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Katya. At this time we'll open the floor to the public if anyone wants to testify on line, this is your opportunity.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we will go on to the Regional Advisory Council recommendation, Chair or designee.

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, Jack Reakoff. The Council voted unanimously to eliminate the closure in 19A east to mirror the recently adopted State regulation which established a Tier II registration permit in the hunt area. The permit would be a joint Federal/State permit that is only available to local communities during July to allow the harvest of one antlered bull per household. The number of
available permits will be announced annually.

There was extensive discussion between the Council, the Office of Subsistence Management and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game regarding this closure. The Council believes the Unit 19A moose population can support limited bull harvest in this area due to the high bull/cow ratios. The Council commented that the only issuing permits -- that only issuing permits to local communities gives local people the first opportunity of obtaining those permits.

So the Council supported eliminating this particular closure.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions for Jack.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll move on to Tribal/Alaska Native Corporation comments, Native Liaison.

MR. LIND: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Orville Lind, Native Liaison, Office of Subsistence Management. There were no comments on WCR20-39.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

We'll move on to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments, State Liaison.

MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Ben Mulligan, Alaska Department of Fish and Game. No comment.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

We'll move to InterAgency Staff Committee comment, ISC Chair.

MS. WORKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The InterAgency Staff Committee offered the standard comment for WCR20-39.

Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any Board discussion with the Council Chair or the State Liaison.

MS. MAAS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

MS. MAAS: The Yukon Kuskokwim Delta Regional Advisory Council also considered this closure review, so I don't know if Alissa's on line to give that recommendation, otherwise I can.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, I'd like to hear that prior to us opening the floor for Board action. Thank you for that Lisa.

Alissa.

MS. MAAS: Okay, not hearing Alissa.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Alissa.

MS. MAAS: Not hearing Alissa, I'll just read it. The Council voted to defer to the Western Interior Council. The Council noted that both the YKDelta and the Western Interior Council supported the original closure in 2007 as well as continuing the closure in 2014 when it was last reviewed. The Council mentioned that some Unit 18 residents do hunt in this area but felt comfortable deferring to and supporting the recommendation of the home region.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for that Lisa. Any other Board discussion with Council Chair or State Liaison, or clarification.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, I'll open up the floor for Board action on this proposal.

MR. PADGETT: Mr. Chair, Chad Padgett with BLM.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: The floor's
yours Chad.

MR. PADGETT: All right, thank you, Sir. I'd like to make a motion. I move to rescind the closure for WCR 20-39 to mirror the new State regulations as amended by OSM. This proposal is Page 993 of the Board book. Following a second I will explain why I intend to support this motion.

MR. SCHMID: This is Dave, I second.

MR. PADGETT: Thank you, Dave. My justification is the following: Due to the conservative nature of the proposal to open the area hunts are extremely conservative with a short season and limited number of permits available. Moose population has slightly increased. There's a small harvestable surplus, it achieves alignment with the recently adopted State regulation and supports the Western Interior Council position with the only difference being the utilization of the State's permit instead of a joint State/Federal permit.

With that, I'll close my motion.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Chad. Any additional Board discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, a call for the question.

MS. PITKA: Question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been called. Roll call, Tom, thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: This is Closure Review WCR 20-39 review the closure to moose hunting in the eastern portion of 19A to all users. The motion on the floor was to eliminate this closure to mirror recently adopted State regulations. The new regulations would read: Unit 19A north of the Kuskokwim River up stream from but excluding the George River drainage and south of the Kuskokwim River up stream and including the Downey Creek drainage, not including the Lime Village Management Area, one antlered bull by State registration permit available in Sleetmute and Stony...
River on July 24th, permits issued on a first come,
first serve basis, number of permits to be announced
annually, the season is September 1 through 5.

Rhonda Pitka.

MS. PITKA: I support eliminating the
closure for WCR20-39 in deference to the Western
Interior Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, very much
Rhonda.

U.S. Forest Service, David Schmid.

MR. SCHMID: Yeah, I support to
eliminate the closure for WCR20-39 in deference to the
Western Interior RAC.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Dave.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Greg
Siekaniec.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Tom. I
support the motion to eliminate the closure in WCR20-39
in deference to the Western Interior Regional Advisory
Council and justification provided by the Bureau of
Land Management.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, very much,
Greg.

National Park Service, Joshua Ream.

MR. REAM: Thank you, Tom. The
National Park service supports eliminating the closure
for WCR20-39 in deference to the Western Interior
Regional Advisory Council.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And Bureau of
Indian Affairs, Gene Peltola.

MR. PELTOLA: BIA votes to modify the
existing closure policy WCR20-39 to mirror the State
regulation as recommended by the Western Interior Regional Advisory Council.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, thank you very much, Gene.

Bureau of Land Management, Chad Padgett.

MR. PADGETT: I support, thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Chad.

Chairman Anthony Christianson.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Support in deference to the RAC. Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The motion passes.

That moves us along, Mr. Chair, to Wildlife Closure Review 20-43.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, we'll call on the Staff present that Tom.

MS. MAAS: All right, thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. For the record my name is Lisa Maas and I'll be presenting a summary of the analysis for Closure Review WCR20-43 which begins on Page 1008 of your meeting book.

Wildlife Closure Review 20-43 pertains to the closure of moose hunting in Unit 19A remainder to everyone except residents of six local communities. Unit 19A remainder is depicted in Map 1 on Page 1010 and includes the western portion of Unit 19A and the Lime Village Management Area. Unit 19A remainder was closed under Federal regulations in 2007 because of conservation concerns including low productivity, low bull/cow ratios and high hunting pressure. A Section .804 analysis determined residents of Tuluksak, Lower Kalskag, Upper Kalskag, Aniak, Chuathbaluk, and Crooked Creek to be most dependent on the Unit 19A remainder moose population.

Authority was delegated to the Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge Manager to annually
announce harvest quotas and number of permits.

Unit 19A remainder primarily falls into the Aniak survey area, while the moose population in the Aniak survey area appeared relatively stable between 2006 and 2010, it increased significantly in 2017 and density estimates for the Aniak survey area in 2017 of 1.3 moose per square mile were well above management objectives of .75 to .93 moose per square mile, however ADF&G also surveyed the entire western portion of Unit 19A for the first time in 2017 and density estimates for this larger area were just below management objectives at .7 moose per square mile. While bull/cow ratios are within management objectives they were on the lower end in 2016 and 2017 averaging 21 bulls per 100 cows. Calf/cow ratios have met or exceeded management objectives since 2011. Predation likely influences moose abundance in Unit 19 and may be limiting population growth. In 2019 ADF&G estimated a harvestable surplus for Unit 19A remainder as 160 to 165 moose per year and total reported harvest is roughly 150 to 160 moose per year. However, low bull/cow ratios in 2016 and 2017 suggest few surplus bulls are available for harvest.

OSM's recommendation is to maintain the closure in western Unit 19A, eliminate the closure for the Lime Village Management Area and remove the regulatory language about quotas and permits and delegate authority to the Yukon Delta Refuge Manager to set quotas and permit numbers via delegation of authority letter only. No change to the closure in western Unit 19A is recommended due to low bull/cow ratios in 2016 and 2017 and because reported harvest approximates the harvestable surplus. Additionally, the Yukon Delta Refuge Manager has delegated authority to adjust in-season harvest parameters. The Lime Village Management Area is currently part of Unit 19A remainder but the Section .804 analysis failed to realize this. OSM recommends establishing the Lime Village Management Area as a separate hunt area similar to State regulations. The recommended season and harvest limits and permit requirements for the Lime Village Management Area mirror the current State regulations. The Lime Village community hunt would not be affected by this modification except that eliminating the Federal closure would allow moose hunting on Federal lands within the Lime Village Management Area under both State and Federal
regulations. A delegation of authority letter simplifies regulations and provides management flexibility.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions for Staff.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

MR. PELTOLA: I have a question in regard to the current regulation, and the stipulation to the Refuge Manager Yukon Delta NWR in corporation with BLM Field Office will annually establish a harvest quota, the number of permits issued in coordination with the State Tier I hunt. You go down to the OSM conclusion, part of that verbiage stipulates that, and remove the regulatory language when referring to establishing quotas, permit numbers and delegate authority to the Yukon Delta NWR manager set quotas, permit numbers via delegation of authority letter only. Have we looked at those residents that are involved in this potential harvest via the .804, we have Tuluksak, Lower Kalskag, Upper Kalskag, Aniak, which are within the conservation unit but Chuathbaluk and Crooked Creek, which is a portion of the main stem of the Kuskokwim going up river, BLM adjacent lands, and it would potentially remove BLM from the delegation aspect of the hunt.

Is BLM aware of that and do they concur with that?

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Well, Gene, if I followed you there, I think your question was to the BLM, and if they were aware that it would exclude them from having oversight in the hunt; am I correct?

MR. PELTOLA: Affirmative, yes, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. BLM.
MR. PADGETT: Mr. Chair, this is Chad.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, you have the floor Chad.

MR. PADGETT: Thank you. Sorry.

Thanks, Gene. I'm looking at it now. This motion was on my list and now I believe it's transferred over to Fish and Wildlife Service, so I'm looking at it now, the in-season management, I did not realize went over to Fish and Wildlife Service, to answer your question.

MS. MAAS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead.

MS. MAAS: Yeah, I just wanted to clarify that even though in Unit 19A there's -- it's mostly BLM land, with a little bit of Fish and Wildlife Service land, the majority of harvest occurs on that Fish and Wildlife Service land because it's just so accessible from the Kuskokwim River. So that's under the Federal regulations where the vast majority of the moose harvest occurs.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA. I just wanted to make sure that BLM was aware with the proposed regulation, if it's being modified, that it would exclude them from the delegation.

Thank you.

MR. PADGETT: Mr. Chair, this is Chad.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead, you have the floor.

MR. PADGETT: Thanks, again, Gene, I've got it. I appreciate it.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, this is Greg.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Greg, you have the floor.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
So, Chad, the delegation to the Refuge Manager is one thing, but the expected coordination would still be there in my opinion. So I don't -- you know, I think -- you know, we would have a high degree of communications with the Bureau of Land Management as well.

MR. PADGETT: Thanks, Greg.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. And I think this was all a question that was spurred to Staff, so if there's no further questions for Staff, we'll move on to the summary of public comment, Regional Council Coordinator.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. Katya Wessels. We received no written public comments for WCR20-43.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Katya. So we'll at this time open the floor to any public who may be on line.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll go to the Regional Advisory Council recommendation, Chair or designee.

MR. REAKOFF: Western Interior Regional Council Chair, Jack Reakoff. The Council voted to unanimously support maintaining the current moose hunting closure in the western portion of 19A as described. The Council is very concerned about the low bull/cow ratio, which is indicating high consumptive use by hunters and that the harvestable surplus is being maximized currently. And so the Council feels that the status quo is warranted.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Jack. Any questions from the Board for Jack.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,
we'll go to the Tribal/Alaska Native Corporation comments, Native Liaison Orville Lind.

MS. MAAS: Yes, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

MS. MAAS: Yeah, the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta Regional Advisory Council also considered this closure review and the YKD Delta Council voted to defer to the Western Interior Council supporting its recommendation.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, thank you for that.

MR. LIND: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Orville Lind, Native Liaison for Office of Subsistence Management. During the consultation session we did not hear any comments on WCR20-43.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Orville. We'll move on to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments, State Liaison.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, this is Greg with the Fish and Wildlife Service.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Greg.

MR. SIEKANIEC: I just wanted to ask Jack a question. Because the information that I have it looks like the Western Interior Regional Advisory Committee [sic] requested to eliminate the Federal closure for the Lime Village Management area, which would then align Federal seasons with State regulations and then to recommend that village residents given .804, to add Lime Village residents to .804 communities for the remainder of 19A in the future.

Jack, is that accurate?

MR. REAKOFF: Yes. The Lime Village area is not accessed very easily but the western portion of 19A is right along the river corridor and
that has heavy hunting pressure and has demonstrated by
the low bull/cow ratio there's that population is still
being harvested fairly heavily so that's why the
disparity in the Council's actions.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Okay, thank you. Thank
you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, thank
you. Any other questions before we call on the State,
Alaska Department of Fish and Game, liaison.

MR. BURCH: Mr. Chair. This is Mark
Burch with the Department of Fish and Game. The State
has no comments on this closure.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
Mark. We'll call on InterAgency Staff Committee
comment, ISC Chair.

MS. WORKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The
InterAgency Staff Committee provided the standard
comment for WCR20-43.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
Board discussion with Council Chairs and State Liaison,
your opportunity to ask questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I'll open the
floor for Federal Board action on this proposal.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, Greg
Siekaniec with the Fish and Wildlife Service.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Greg, you
have the floor.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
I move to support Wildlife Closure Review 20-43 as
modified by the Office of Subsistence Management.
Modified wildlife closure language is shown on Page
1021 of the Board book. Following a second, I will
provide justification for why I support this motion.

MS. PITKA: This is Rhonda Pitka, I'll
second.
MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you. The modified closure supports the Western Interior Regional Advisory Committee [sic] request to eliminate the Federal closure for the Lime Village Management Area and aligns Federal seasons with State regulations, thus, reducing regulatory confusion.

Since the bull/cow ratio in the western portion of Unit 19A remainder is at the lower end of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game objective, it makes sense to wait until a more robust bull/cow ratio is detected before relaxing the closure in this area. The increased harvest opportunities for Lime Village, the Western Interior Regional Advisory Council may want to consider submitting a proposal to the Board to add Lime Village residents to the .804 communities for Unit 19A remainder.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any Board discussion, deliberation.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll call for the question.

MR. SCHMID: Question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

Roll call, please, Tom.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yes, Mr. Chair. This pertains to Closure Review WCR20-43 review closure to moose hunting in Unit 19A remainder, except by the residents of Tuluksak, Lower Kalskag, Upper Kalskag, Aniak and Chuathbaluk and Crooked Creek. It's to modify the closure for WCR20-43 to maintain the closure in the western portion of Unit 19A, eliminate the closure for Lime Village Management Area, establish seasons, harvest limits and permit requirements for Lime Village Management Area hunt area and remove the regulatory language referring to establishing quotas and permit numbers and delegate authority to the Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge manager to set quotas and permit numbers via delegation of authority letter only. There was also the recommendation to see if Lime Village could be added to that as well.
I'll start with Bureau of Indian Affairs, Gene Peltola.

MR. PELTOLA: BIA votes to support maintaining the closure as modified.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Gene.

Bureau of Land Management, Chad Padgett.

MR. PADGETT: I support to maintain the closure as modified. Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thanks, Chad.

National Park Service, Don Striker or Josh Ream.

MR. REAM: The National Park Service votes to maintain as modified as well. Thank you, very much.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Josh.

Rhonda Pitka.

MS. PITKA: Hi. I vote to modify the closure. Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Rhonda.

U.S. Forest Service, Dave Schmid.

MR. SCHMID: Also support the modified closure for WCR20-43.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Dave.


MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Tom. I support to maintain the closure of WCR20-43 as modified in deference to the Western Interior Regional Advisory Council and justification provided.

Thank you.
MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, very much, Greg.
And Chairman Anthony Christianson.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support in deference to the RAC.
MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Tony. The motion passes. This brings us, Mr. Chair, to Wildlife Proposal 20-38.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. We'll call on the Staff to present that, thank you.
(Pause)
MR. DOOLITTLE: These are Seward Peninsula proposals, looking for Lisa or Suzanne.
MS. MAAS: Yes, that's me, sorry, just a moment.
MR. DOOLITTLE:Alrighty, Lisa, no problem.
MS. MAAS: Okay. So, yeah, I'll be presenting a summary of the analysis for Wildlife Proposal 20-38 which begins on Page 1029 of your meeting book.
Proposal WP20-38 was submitted by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and requests that the December and January moose seasons in Unit 22D remainder be combined into a may be announced season. That the October 1st to November 30th season be eliminated. And that the harvest limit for all seasons be modified to one bull by State registration permit.
Of note, a similar proposal WP20-39 also requests changes to the Unit 22D remainder moose regulations. WP20-39 is on the consensus agenda as take no action.
Proposal WP20-40 requests closing moose hunting in Unit 22D remainder to non-Federally-qualified users. WP20-40 will be considered next, but, please remember that action taken on WP20-38 will affect the effects of WP20-40.
The proponent is concerned about cow moose harvest, disturbance of breeding bulls and the declining moose population and bull/cow ratios in Unit 22D remainder. The proponent believes current harvest levels are not sustainable and that requiring a State registration permit will provide better harvest data to help manage moose harvest at sustainable levels.

Since 2016, the Board has approved special action requests to eliminate the December cow moose season in Unit 22D remainder because of conservation concerns. In 2019 ADF&G submitted Proposal 33 to the Alaska Board of Game requesting the same changes as this proposal. The Board of Game adopted Proposal 33 at its January 2020 meeting effective July of this year. The Board of Game also adopted Proposal 35 which limits permit availability to Unit 22 vendors between July 27th and August 25th, meaning non-local hunters will have to make an additional trip to Unit 22 to obtain a permit.

The Unit 22D moose population declined substantially between 2011 and 2014 and was half of the population objective. No population surveys have been conducted since 2014. Bull/cow ratios have also declined and are below the State objective of 30 bulls per 100 cows. In 2018 the ratio was only 18 bulls per 100 cows. Recruitment also appears poor, only 12 percent in 2018. Moose harvest in Unit 22D remainder exceeds the harvestable surplus and is unsustainable. Current harvest rates are seven to 10 percent while harvest rates of three to five percent are recommended. Unit 22 residents account for 74 percent of reported moose harvest in Unit 22D remainder, and 59 percent of reported harvest occurs in October. While adopting this proposal would decrease opportunity for subsistence users, it could help protect to recover the reclining moose population in Unit 22D remainder. Requiring a State registration permit would allow for more accurate harvest data and uses a harvest quota to conserve the moose population and ensure sustainable harvest. Adopting this proposal would align State and Federal regulations.

The OSM conclusion is to support WP20-38 with modification to delegate authority to the Federal manager to announce harvest quotas, close the fall season and open a may be announced season between December 1st and January 31st via delegation of
authority letter only and to modify the harvest limit for the may be announced season to be one antlered bull. The proponent intended for the winter season harvest limit to be one antlered bull to prevent accidental take and harassment of cows and to align with State regulations.

Another consideration for this proposal is how and where to address delegated authority.

OSM recommends putting it in a delegation of authority letter. The other option is to have this language in unit specific regulations. The Seward Peninsula Council and the State did not explicitly address delegated authority in their recommendation, however, the Board must address this language in order for the regulation to be complete.

It's also worth remembering, that WP20-40 also concerns moose in Unit 22D remainder and will be considered next.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

We'll call on the summary of public comments from the Regional Council Coordinator.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. Katya Wessels, OSM for the record. We received no written public comments for WP20-38.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. We'll open up the floor to public testimony, anybody on line.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll go ahead and move on to Regional Advisory Council recommendations, Chair or designee.
MR. GREEN: Hello, Mr. Chair, this is Louis Green, Seward Peninsula Chair. Am I coming through good?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, and welcome aboard Louis, I hear you fine.

MR. GREEN: All right, thank you. The Council voted unanimously to support the WP20-38 with modification to modify the harvest limit for the December 1st, January 31st season to one antlered bull in Unit 22D remainder. The Council believes it may be -- the may be announced system for the winter hunt would be the best to protect the low moose population in Unit 22D remainder and allow for additional harvest during December and January only if the harvest quota was not met in the fall. We were -- as a Council we were reluctant to eliminate that October 1st to November 30th because of the percentage reported by the State at that time but we get that sacrifice is necessary to protect the bulls in rut at that time. And the idea for the antlered hunt to be taking place, antlered bull, was to make sure that there was no cows taken. The Council agreed that a registration permit is needed to capture the actual moose harvest in Unit 22.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Louis. Any questions for Louis.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hello, was somebody trying to be recognized.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, this is Greg.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Greg, you have the floor.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Could I ask Lisa a question, so twice in her presentation she noted the
relationship between 38 and 40, and I was just
wondering if she could expound on that just a little
bit for me.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Lisa,
please.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll call on
Lisa again.

MS. WORKER: Mr. Chair, it's Suzanne.
I think I can answer that question if Lisa's not
available.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, thank
you, Suzanne, you have the floor.

MS. WORKER: Mr. Siekaniec, Proposal
WP20-40 requests that moose hunting in Unit 22D
remainder -- it request the Federal public lands are
closed in Unit 22D remainder to the harvest of moose.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Okay, thank you,
Suzanne.

MS. WORKER: Sure.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I'm sorry,
guys, I keep getting somebody choppy and it sounds like
they're trying to be recognized so I apologize.

(Pause)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other
questions for the Staff or the Regional Advisory
Council Chair.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,
we'll move on to the Tribal/Alaska Native Corporation
comments, Native Liaison Orville Lind.
MR. LIND: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
Orville Lind, Native Liaison, Office of Subsistence
Management. During the consultation we had no comments
on WP20-38.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Orville. Next we'll call on the State, Alaska
Department of Fish and Game, State Liaison.

MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
For the record, Ben Mulligan, Alaska Department of Fish
and Game. The Department supports WP20-38 the creation
of a registration permit hunt in the Unit 22 remainder
hunt area in order to maintain harvest at sustainable
levels and improve reporting compliance. Declines in
the bull/cow ratio suggests that the current level of
harvest is not sustainable and that management action
should be taken to reduce harvest in the area for that
concern. The Board of Game took action during the
January meeting that mirrors this proposal.

I will note that we had area Staff
review OSM's modifications and the Department is in
support of those.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
questions for the State.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll call on
InterAgency Staff Committee comment, ISC Chair.

MS. WORKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
It's Suzanne again. And before I deliver the
InterAgency Staff Committee, I just want to clarify my
answer to Mr. Siekaniec's question. So WP20-40
requests that Federal public lands in Unit 22D
remainder be closed to moose hunting except by
Federally-qualified subsistence users. So that last
detail is an important one.

The InterAgency Staff Committee
provided the standard comment for WP20-38.
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Suzanne. We'll move on to any Board discussion with Council Chair or the State Liaison.

MS. ROGERS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead.

MS. ROGERS: Sorry, Mr. Chair, this is Alissa Rogers with the YKDelta RAC, Subsistence Council.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have the floor Alissa.

MS. ROGERS: Sorry about that, disregard.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, okay, no comment.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead, BIA, Gene, you have the floor.

MR. PELTOLA: Yeah, I have one question. So while I understand it correctly that the Council modification presented by the Seward Penn became the OSM modified conclusion; is that correct?

MS. MAAS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead, Lisa.

MS. MAAS: Yeah, thank you, guys, I'm glad you can hear me now.

The only major difference between the OSM conclusion and the Seward Peninsula Council recommendation is considering the delegation of authority, because the Council didn't explicitly address this, so -- but the OSM recommendation recommends putting that in a delegation of authority letter and the Board needs to address that somehow, whether it's in regulations or in a delegation of
authority letter so it's a complete regulation.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, appreciate that. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any other Board discussion, questions, clarification.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: If not, we'll open up the floor for Federal Board action on this proposal.

MR. PADGETT: Mr. Chair, Chad Padgett with BLM.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Chad, you have the floor.

MR. PADGETT: I move to adopt WP20-38 as modified by OSM. This proposal is shown on Page 1029 of the Board book. Following a second, I will explain why I intend to support this motion.

MR. SCHMID: I second.

MR. PADGETT: Thank you. It helps to maintain the long-term viability of moose in this area by preventing the take and harassment of cow moose. Fixes a typographical error to make it clear that the intent of the proponent was to modify the harvest limit, to be one antlered bull during the proposed December to January 31st season. It supports the RAC modification. The OSM modification is inclusive of the RAC modification and only adds the delegation of authority letter. It also retains flexibility.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Chad. Any further Board discussion, deliberation.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: A call for the question.

MR. SCHMID: Question.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been called. Roll call, Tom, please.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Proposal WP20-38, requests that December and January moose season in Unit 22D remainder be combined in to a may be announced season, that October 1 through November 30 season be eliminated and that the harvest be modified to one bull by State registration permit for both remaining seasons. The motion on the floor is to support Proposal WP20-38 with modification, the OSM conclusion, to delegate authority to the Federal manager to announce harvest quotas, close the fall season and to open a may be announced season between December 1 and January 31 via delegation of authority letter only and modify the harvest limits for the may be announced season between December 1 and January 31 to be one antlered bull. The modification reg should read: Unit 22D remainder, one bull by State registration permit, August 10th through September 14, and Unit 22D remainder, one antlered bull by State registration permit season may be announced December 1 through January 31st.

I'll start with National Park Service, Don Striker.

MR. REAM: Hi, Tom, this is Josh, I'm going to sit in for the Park Service for this one and Don will be back on starting with the next proposal.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay. Yeah, I just got the text about it, so your vote.

MR. REAM: The National Park Service is in support with the modification that was offered in the motion, this is in deference to the RAC as well as to the justification that was provided by the BLM.

Thank you, very much.

MR. DOOLITTLE: All right, thank you, very much Josh.

U.S. Forest Service, David Schmid.

MR. SCHMID: I also support WP20-38 with the OSM modification and the justification provided by BLM and in deference to the Seward
Peninsula RAC.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Dave.

Bureau of Land Management, Chad Padgett.

MR. PADGETT: I support, thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Chad.

Bureau of Indian Affairs, Gene Peltola.

MR. PELTOLA: BIA votes to support with modification and justification provided by BLM.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Gene.

Rhonda Pitka.

MS. PITKA: I support as modified with the justification provided by the BLM. Thank you, bye.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Rhonda.


MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Tom. I support the motion for WP20-38 as modified by the Office of Subsistence Management and in deference to the Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory Council and the Bureau of Land Management's justification.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Greg.

And last but not least, Chairman Anthony Christianson.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support in deference. Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay, the motion passes.

Mr. Chair, that brings us to Wildlife Proposal 20-40.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I'll call on the Staff to present, thank you.

MS. MAAS: Okay, thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the Board. For the record this is Lisa Maas and I'll be presenting a summary of the analysis for Wildlife Proposal WP20-40, which begins on Page 1053 of your meeting book.

Proposal WP20-40 was submitted by the Seward Peninsula Council and requests closing moose hunting in Unit 22D remainder to non-Federally-qualified users. The proponent is concerned about cow moose harvest in Unit 22D remainder due to a declining moose population and states that closing Federal public lands to non-Federally-qualified users would help conserve the moose population and allow subsistence users to meet their needs.

Federal public lands in Unit 22D remainder was close to non-Federally-qualified users in 2002 to improve subsistence harvest opportunities and to help conserve the moose population. The Board eliminated this closure in 2007 because of improvement in the Unit 22D moose population and bull/cow ratios.

Relevant biological and harvest information was already provided during the presentation of WP20-38.

Due to regulatory actions taken by the State, as well as actions just taken by the Board on WP20-38 adopting WP20-40 may slightly reduce competition from non-local resident hunters so it'd likely do little to conserve the Unit 22D moose population for several reasons.

First, only eight percent of the Unit 22D remainder hunt area is Federal public lands.

Second, the State established a harvest quota for Unit 22D remainder, which limits harvest to sustainable levels.

Third, the non-resident season is already closed under State regulations.

Fourth, Federally-qualified subsistence users account for 74 percent of the moose harvest in
Unit 22D remainder, and harvest by non-local residents will likely decline as a result of Proposal 35, which limits permit availability.

Fifth, State Proposal 33 and WP20-38 eliminate the October season when 59 percent of the moose harvest occurred on average when bull moose a most susceptible to harvest.

Finally, since the RM840 permit was required in other Unit 22 hunt areas in 2004, the numbers of hunters in Unit 22D remainder has nearly tripled. Requiring the RM840 permit in Unit 22D remainder will likely decrease hunting numbers in that area redistributing them to other road accessible hunt areas.

The OSM conclusion is to oppose WP20-40.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Staff, for that presentation. Any questions for Staff.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing, none, we'll open the floor to summary of public comment, Regional Council Coordinator.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. Katya Wessels with OSM. We received no written public comments for WP20-40.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. We'll open up the floor at this time to public testimony, anybody on line.

(No comments)

OPERATOR: At this time I'm showing no one on line.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. We'll call on Regional Advisory Council recommendation, Chair or designee.
MR. GREEN: Oops, hit the wrong button there, so, sorry Mr. Chair. The Council voted unanimously to support Wildlife Proposal 20-40. The Council had submitted this proposal to protect the moose population of Unit 22D remainder by eliminating non-local harvest while still allowing harvest by Federally-qualified users in the region. The Council noted that other subunits in Unit 22D is currently closed to non-Federally-qualified users.

Thanks.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Louis Green, for that.

MR. GREEN: Thanks for mentioning my name.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes. Any questions for the Council Chair.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, Bureau of Indian Affairs.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Gene, you have the floor.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yeah, Louis, Gene, with BIA here. So the recent Board of Game action where they adopted Proposal 33 which established the harvest quota of 18 bull moose for 22D remainder which greatly limits the potential harvest in this area, do you feel that that action by the Board of Game would address the Seward Penn Regional Advisory Council's current concern about conservation?

Thank you.

MR. GREEN: Yes, through the Chair. Yes, Gene. Thanks for the question.

MR. PELTOLA: Okay, thank you, Louis, appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other questions for the Regional Chair.

(No comments)
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, thank you, Louis. We'll move on to Tribal/Alaska Native Corporation comments, Native Liaison.

MR. LIND: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Orville Lind, Native Liaison, Office of Subsistence Management. During the consultation session there was no comments made on WP20-40. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Orville. Next we'll call on the State, Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments, State Liaison.

MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the record, Ben Mulligan, Alaska Department of Fish and Game. The Department is opposed to this proposal given the action that was recently taken on WP20-38. We feel that that action was a prudent step toward addressing the concerns regarding this moose population. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. We'll move to InterAgency Staff Committee comment, ISC Chair.

MS. WORKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The InterAgency Staff Committee provided the standard comment for WP20-40.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Board discussion with Council Chair and State Liaison.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll open the floor for Federal Board action on this proposal.

MR. PADGETT: Mr. Chair, Chad Padgett with BLM.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor, Chad.
MR. PADGETT: Thank you. I move to adopt WP20-40 as submitted by the Seward Peninsula Subsistence Regional Advisory Council. This proposal is shown on Page 2053 of the Board book. Following a second I will explain why I intend to oppose this motion.

MR. PELTOLA: BIA seconds.

MR. PADGETT: Thank you, Gene. My justification is the following: Given the Board of Game's recent action, this proposal would likely do little to conserve the moose population due to low percent of Federal public lands in the area. The State's harvest quota greatly limits harvest. The State's non-resident season is closed. The majority of the subsistence harvest is by Federally-qualified subsistence users. The new State permitting requirements for 22D will likely distribute hunters to other areas.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Chad. Any other Board discussion, deliberation. 

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Move to roll call, Tom, thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Proposal WP20-40 that requests the Federal public lands in Unit 22D remainder be closed to moose hunting except by Federally-qualified subsistence users.

I'll start with the National Park Service, Don Striker.

MR. STRIKER: Thank you. The National Park Service supports 20-40 in deference to the Seward Peninsula RAC and our understanding of broad local support.

Thank you.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Tom. I oppose as I concur with the Bureau of Land Management and the Office of Subsistence Management justifications oppose the Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory Committee request in light of the recent regulatory changes and in response, as we just heard from the Chair, that this should satisfy the conservation concern.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you.

Bureau of Land Management, Chad Padgett.

MR. PADGETT: I support as stated, thank you. I'm sorry, I oppose as stated, sorry about that.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I almost caught you.

(Laughter)

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay, thank you very much.

U.S. Forest Service, Dave Schmid.

MR. SCHMID: You had me all confused there Chad. The Forest Service is going to support WP20-40 primarily in deference to the RAC as well as OSM supports this proposal.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Bureau of Indian Affairs, Gene Peltola.

MR. PELTOLA: The Bureau of Indian Affairs opposes WP20-40 based on the Chair of the Seward Penn Regional Advisory Council's thinking that the conservation concerns have been addressed by the Board of Game during their January 2020 meeting, the actions taken, in addition to Federal public lands only constitute eight percent of this subunit and the Bureau feels a coordinated approach with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game might better address any remaining conservation and subsistence user concerns.
Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Gene.

Rhonda Pitka.

MS. PITKA: I support in deference to the Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory Council. Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Rhonda.

Chairman Anthony Christianson.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support in deference to the RAC.

MR. DOOLITTLE: The motion passes.

MS. PITKA: Did Charlie Brower make it back on line?

MR. DOOLITTLE: No, Charlie is not back on line Rhonda.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA. May I make a comment?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead, Gene, you have the floor.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So here's an example where I think the public members of the Board are under represented. As an agency Board member we have ISC members that could back us up in our absence and vote on our behalf, and that -- I think the Board should look at a similar policy to address that for the public members as well.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for that statement, Gene, appreciate it.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay, Mr. Chair, we're moving on to Wildlife Proposal WP20-41.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll call on the Staff to present that to us, thank you.
MS. VOORHEES: Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. This is Hannah Voorhees, I'm an anthropologist with OSM. I will be presenting Wildlife Proposal 20-41 and 20-42. Both pertain to rescinding Federal public land closures in 22A and share background biology and regulatory history. So I will address the shared elements in this presentation and forego them in the next. Wildlife Proposal 20-41 begins on Page 1070 of your Board book.

This proposal was submitted by Lance Kronberger of Eagle River, and requests that the Federal public land closure for moose in the portion of Unit 22 north of, and including the Tagoomenik and Shaktoolik River drainages which is also known as 22A north be rescinded September 1st to September 20th to coincide with the State's non-resident moose season.

The proponent states that the closure serves to concentrate all moose hunting on to a small area of State managed lands and that rescinding the closure would reduce conflicts in the field. The Board considered this same proposal during the last regulatory cycle. At that time Federal public lands in 22A north were closed to the harvest of moose except by residents of 22A. In 2018 the Board adopted the previous version of this proposal with modification expanding moose hunting opportunity on Federal public lands in 22A north to all residents of Unit 22, that is, those with C&T in Unit 22 for moose. This was an incremental liberalization that stopped short of opening 22A north to non-Federally-qualified users.

Also of note, in January of 2017 the Board of Game added six days to what had previously been a 14 day non-resident hunt.

No new biological information has become available since the Board's expansion of the user pool in 2018. Management decisions for moose throughout 22A including 22A north have typically been based on data from 22A central, the Unalakleet drainage area. A most recent population survey of 22A central from 2017 estimated that there are 840 moose in that area, that estimate is above the State's population objective of 600 to 800 moose. The population grew at a rate of nine percent annually between 2012 and 2017. However, this is still a low density population at just .35 moose per square mile. In 2017, recruitment was 12
percent, which was the lowest in about decade.

However, local biologists characterize this recruitment as adequate. As of 2016 the bull/cow ratio is very high at 124 bulls to 100 cows. The objective is 30 bulls to 100 cows.

Reported non-local harvest is low at just one to two moose per year. Local harvest is documented through harvest tickets and is likely under reported. No local harvest was reported between 2016 and 2018. Shaktoolik, the only community located in 22A north primarily takes moose in August and September, with efforts focused along the Shaktoolik and Tagoomenik drainages. The most recent subsistence survey from 2009 shows Shaktoolik harvesting eight moose in that survey year.

Currently there are five guides eligible to use this area if the closure is lifted. BLM permits would be required for additional guides. There is no cap on the number of transporters who could operate in the area.

If this proposal is adopted, Federal public lands in Unit 22A north will be open to all users September 1st through September 20th. It is uncertain what effects this will have on the moose population in the area which remains low density. The effect on Federally-qualified subsistence users is also uncertain. There is no updated subsistence survey research to show whether local residents are meeting their needs for moose. Opening Federal public lands may reduce user conflicts by decentralizing use by guided hunters who access the area via aircraft, however, opening Federal public lands could also result in increased competition and conflict with both non-local residents and non-resident hunters along the Shaktoolik River where Federally-qualified subsistence users have customarily focused their fall hunting.

Maintaining the status quo until additional information is available reflecting recent incremental management decisions by the Board and the State will assure that subsistence use continues to be prioritized.

The OSM conclusion is to oppose Wildlife Proposal 20-41.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.
I'll standby for any questions.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, hearing, none, we'll open the floor to summary of public comment, Regional Council Coordinator.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. For the record, Katya Wessels with OSM. And we did not receive any written public comments for WP20-41.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Katya. We'll move to open the floor to any public who may be on line that wants to testify to this proposal.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll move on to the Regional Advisory Council recommendation, Chair or designee.

OPERATOR: Sir, we do have someone who has cued up, Lance Kronberger, their line is open.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for that Operator, appreciate it. Lance, you have the floor.

MR. KRONBERGER: Can you guys here me all right.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Sounds good, got you Lance, you have the floor.

MR. KRONBERGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. I'll just give you some history that I have in Unit 22A north.

I personally started hunting and guiding in Unit 22A north in 2005. Since 2005 our guide service has harvested close to 150 brown bears in 22A north. Over the past 10 years I have personally
observed a dramatic increase in the moose population within 22A north.

In 2017 I submitted a proposal to the Alaska Board of Game to extend the moose season from September 1st through the 14th, to September 1st through the 20th. The Board of Game expressed concern about the increased non-resident harvest but concluded that the high bull/cow ratio in the area provided sufficient protection against overharvest. My proposal was adopted.

Since 2017 the non-resident harvest has remained the same as it was before 2017.

In 2018 I submitted Proposal WP18-38, I requested that the Federal public land closures for non-qualified moose hunting in Unit 22A north be rescinded. Although the Board adopted the proposal with modification, it was not adopted as I had originally intended.

In 2005 our guide service started guiding brown bears in 22A north. We have put a lot of energy and resource into harvesting large male brown bears, many of which are moose calf killers. We have seen bears kill moose -- we have killed bears while they are stalking moose calves, pursuing moose calves and even eating moose calves. Since 2014 we have harvested 57 brown bears in 22A north. We have seen a constant increase in the moose population within 22A north. I believe at least some of this increase can be attributed to the number of brown bears that have been removed from the 22A north population. A large portion of our brown bear hunts take place on Federal public lands, which we access via aircraft. We hunt these lands for approximately a month in the spring and a month in the fall. It is extremely rare that we ever see any other users on these Federal public lands due to the difficulty in accessing these very remote places.

During our years of guiding, spring and fall brown bear hunters in 22A north, we have kept track of the moose we observe in our many days glassing the river bottoms, alder patches and tundra hillside. In the last 10 years we have observed a doubling of the moose population. We spend over 100 man days every year, both spring and fall, inventorying the wildlife
in Unit 22A north. We have observed a dramatic increase in calf survival from the spring observations to our fall sightings. The last couple of years we have noticed almost 50 percent of the cow moose have at least one calf during the fall sightings. Because our spring brown bear hunting season takes place from mid-May through mid-June, we are able to tell the difference between cow moose and bull moose. By mid-May the bulls have enough horn growth to determine what sex they are. With the increase in moose sightings we have also observed a noticeable increase in bull moose numbers. Over the last couple of years we have observed a greater than one bull per cow within 22A north.

The Board of Game extended the moose season September 1st through the 14th to September 1st through the 20th, there was expressed concern that the extended season would allow a huge increase in non-resident harvest. I explained the difficulty of accessing the area along with the guiding dynamics that occur in 22A north, prior to 2017 the average non-resident moose harvest was less than two per year, and since the season extension by Board of Game, the non-resident harvest had stayed less than two per year. This increased moose harvest was also expressed concern by the Federal Subsistence Board on my 2018 proposal that they adopted with modification allowing for all residents of Unit 22 to hunt Federal lands. There was concern that there was going to be increased harvest from opening Federal lands, and after two hunting seasons there has not been any increased harvest -- any increased resident harvest within Unit 22A. This is because of access. The main access routes in 22A north are already open to non-qualified hunters, they are the Shaktoolik and the Niukluk Rivers. Unless you have a very good Bush pilot with an aircraft, the Federal lands within 22A north are inaccessible. This Federal land closure to non-qualified users does nothing more than concentrate Federally-qualified residents, non-qualified residents and guided non-residents all along the same travel corridors. This area can sustain some increased harvest along with allowing people with different methods of access to spread out. The last five years of antler spread for non-resident moose harvest in 22A north was 68 inches. This statistic demonstrates the older age class bulls that are targeted by the non-resident hunters. Many of these bulls very well could be past their prime breeding age.
and no longer a benefit to the moose population.

Alaska Department of Fish and Game notes that there is a very high bull to cow ratio within 22A, 124 bulls per 100 cows, this allowing for more bull harvest, especially the older aged class bulls that non-resident hunters target.

OSM cautions that by lifting the Federal land restrictions there would be an increased guide use. Board of Game cautioned that there may be the same increase when they extended the season. And that did not happen. If guides offer moose hunts in 22A, they most likely will be offering guided moose hunts in 22A right now. This is because the best access is already available in guided non-resident hunters. The lower portions of the Shaktoolik and Niukluk Rivers both are surrounded by State selected lands where there is good access and good moose hunting. As a matter of fact, most of the useable stretches of rivers for local hunters are the same stretches of river that are accessible to non-resident hunters. If the restrictions were to be lifted on Federal lands, the local hunters would probably see less competition as it would give the current users an opportunity to use different methods to access remote parts of Unit 22A north.

Each year I spend two months working out of Unalakleet, Alaska. Unalakleet is a wonderful community and I have many life long friends there. Our operation works very hard at being conscious of the local traditions, along with making sure we are an asset to the community. Our operation rents a house from a local resident, buys most of our supplies at the local stores, and eats many meals at the local restaurants along with hiring the local air taxi. Along with being part of the local economy, we work very hard to donate meat to local residents. Our hunt contract only allows guided moose hunters to take home backstraps and tenderloins from their moose harvest, the rest of the meat gets donated to the local residents. In a lot of cases we personally transport and donate the moose meat to the local households. And in other cases there are people within the community who knows of families and elders that could use the moose meat and they make sure they're all taken care of. I have letters from the Unalakleet residents stating to our contributions to the community.
At the end of the day there is no reason that Federal lands within 22A north should be closed for non-qualified users, there is no legitimate conservation concerns as documented by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, and our personal observations. There is actually greater evidence to open Federal lands to reduce the possibility of in the field conflict and spread out the harvest all over 22A north. By concentrating all the harvest into just a few river corridors, it's not the best way to manage the moose population within 22A north. Opening Federal lands to non-qualified users needs to be a win-win for everyone and it can be. The non-qualified hunters that we guide are looking for a great experience in wild and remote places like 22A north. They are looking to pursue an old age-class moose, which 22A north has a surplus of and have an opportunity to take home a set of antlers, cape and 50 pounds of moose meat. They do not want to take all the meat that comes with harvesting a large bull moose, nor would I allow them to take all the meat. Donating the meat to locals is enjoyed, not only by the one who receives, but also by the hunter who gets to see the gratitude the local community expresses.

The guided non-resident hunter just wants an experience and an opportunity. They have no problem with spending money in many of the small communities. We have many hunters that buy scrimshaw walrus tusks, fur hats, seal gloves, tanned hide, and many other items that local sell. These items have come from Shishmaref, Shakttoolik, Unalakleet and other local communities. By continuing to close Federal lands within Unit 22A north, many user groups and communities will suffer. This closure does not prevent non-qualified users the opportunity to harvest an old age class moose, but also congregates hunters, keeps moose meat from being donated to locals and money from being spent in local communities.

These are all good reasons to remove the non-qualified closure, but the main reason to allow non-qualified hunters is because there's no biological concern. Alaska Department of Fish and Game has stated it, our observations have noted it and the recent age harvest shows it. I urge you to remove the non-qualified regulations to hunt moose in Unit 22A north.

Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

Anybody have any questions for Lance.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, Bureau of Indian Affairs.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, go ahead, Gene, you have the floor.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Kronberger, you submitted this proposal prior to the Federal Subsistence Board, correct?

MR. KRONBERGER: Yes.

MR. PELTOLA: Okay. And by submitting the proposal and you're an active big game guide in Alaska and so I assume you have a permit from the Bureau of Land Management, correct?

MR. KRONBERGER: That is correct.

MR. PELTOLA: And is there any stipulation or limitation on your guide concession permit from BLM that limits you to either a number of clients or number of moose harvested?

MR. KRONBERGER: On my permit I am -- I'm issued a 10 year permit and I state the number of clients that I am taking for the number of species. The BLM does not issue or tell me how many I can take, but in my operation plan I need to tell them what I am proposing.

MR. PELTOLA: Okay, thank you much, Sir, I appreciate it.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chair, I have a question for Lance.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead.

MR. GREEN: Lance, you're talking about numbers, the last time in the last go around we went through this back and forth, and what I want to know is has Fish and Game done any aerial counts to date?

MR. KRONBERGER: Through the Chair. We have asked Fish and Game to do counts in both 22A north
and 22A remainder and, you know, their response is it's a big state and they have lots of places they need to survey, these are low priority. We've even proposed to do -- have our pilots have someone do it but that's not allowed so as far as -- to my knowledge Fish and Game has not done a survey and it's frustrating for all of us because I would love to have a survey done as much as everybody else but the fact of the matter is, I think if it was the other way around and the moose population was declining, and going the opposite way, that the 22 central moose count that gets extrapolated into these other areas would be used and be sufficient to close things and it's frustrating that we cannot use that data to open things back up.

MR. GREEN: Thank you for that answer, through the Chair. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any other additional questions for Lance.

MR. PADGETT: Mr. Chair, this is Chad Padgett with BLM.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Chad, you have the floor.

MR. PADGETT: Thank you. Lance, just a couple of quick questions here. Do you -- right now with the Covid-19 issues, are you experiencing -- what does your clientele look like this year, are you going to be able to have any hunts? I'm just curious how it's affected you so far.

MR. KRONBERGER: Yes, through the Chair. It's had a dramatic affect on us. We run spring bear hunts on Kodiak, the Alaska Peninsula and out of Unalakleet, and as the restrictions state right now we're out of business. So it is just -- the State restrictions, as it is right now all my clients are planning on coming this fall as long as the State restrictions allow it. We've already tried to get things in motion to be very, very conscious of the local communities and how we're going to pretty much try to avoid even landing there, chartering straight from Anchorage to the field as much as possible. So I am hopeful that we will be operating this fall but I am also cautious that that might not happen.
MR. PADGETT: Thank you. And then another question, back to your permit. When you're issued a permit by our field Staff, I know it doesn't necessarily have a limitation but do you have to justify the take?

MR. KRONBERGER: Through the Chair. I don't totally understand what it means by justify or how I would justify. But I -- like I said, I was issued a permit in 2005 and I've had a great, very, very good working relationship with the BLM and they've -- you know, if I state that I was going to take this many bear hunters or this many moose hunters, there hasn't been an issue and I haven't had to justify it.

I think we've tried to do a really good job of harvesting older animals, both moose and brown bear, and try to be very, very conscious of the conservation concerns. Like I said, I've been in 22A north since 200 -- this is going on 15 years, you know, I spend a lot of time sleeping in a tent out there, I don't want to just go out there and make a mess, conservation-wise, trying to make a quick dollar.

MR. PADGETT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, this is Louis, I got dropped off the call right then when I -- I cut myself off there with Lance, so I just got back on, just letting you know.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Louis, did you have any more questions or discussion.

MR. GREEN: I was going to ask -- no, I don't have anything right at the moment. I would like to say -- tell, Lance, thanks for thinning the bears out, that's a positive, but these numbers are questionable as far as the moose counts there. The State hasn't done anything.

Thank you.

MS. WORKER: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead.

MS. WORKER: This is Suzanne Worker.
Before we move on from public comment, I would just like to acknowledge that Mr. Kronberger submitted two comments in support of his operation from residents of Unalakleet, that occurred earlier this week. They were not included in the summary because they just arrived, but they were forwarded to the Board for their consideration.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Susan.

Any further discussion or questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, thank you, Lance, appreciate you calling in.

MR. KRONBERGER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Operator, is there anybody else on line that would like to speak?

OPERATOR: Not at this time, Sir, no others.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

We'll move on to Regional Advisory Council recommendation, Chair or designee.

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Louis Green from Seward Peninsula RAC. It's evident that the State hasn't done any counts, and it continues to be a minimal, or extrapolated information on moose populations in portions of Unit 22A. Easy access by non-local or guided aircraft hunters, two moose could negatively impact subsistence users. It's -- the thought of, if you got breeding bulls up in there and they can't get to them, they're just adding to the population. I heard what he said about too old to breed, that's speculative. So some of the Council members stated that the habitat where the moose populations go for protection from harvest, and frequently accessed by non-locals and aircraft. Harvest in these areas could impair the herd's opportunity to grow.
Chairman Christianson: Thank you, Louis. Any questions for Louis from the Board.

(No comments)

Chairman Christianson: All right, hearing none, we will move on to Tribal/Alaska Native Corporation comments, Native Liaison.

Mr. Lind: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Orville Lind, Native Liaison for Office of Subsistence Management. During the consultation session there were no comments made.

Thank you, Mr. Chair

Chairman Christianson: Thank you, Orville. Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments, State Liaison.

Mr. Mulligan: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the record, Ben Mulligan, Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

The Department does support this proposal. We feel this is not expected to pose a biological concern to the local moose population in 22A north. Considering the low combined reported harvest, and estimated harvest in the area, the potential increased harvest in Unit 22A north resulting from approval of this proposal is unlikely to exceed the harvestable surplus of moose in the area.

Hunting under State authority in Unit 22A north will require hunter effort and success reporting, which it can always be used to better understand moose abundance in the area.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairman Christianson: Thank you. Any questions for the State.

Mr. Green: Mr. Chair, this is Louis.

Chairman Christianson: Yes, Louis, go ahead.
MR. GREEN: Thank you. Through the Chair, when is the State going to do an aerial survey, do they have any plans for this? This has been a contentious point here in this conversation we've been having for the last few years, so I'm just curious on what the State's position is on this.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MR. MULLIGAN: Through the Chair.

Louis, I don't know that answer off the top of your [sic] head, we've done 22 central in 2017, and I'd have to check with area Staff. We could have had it very well planned this year but with Covid restrictions a lot of our aerial surveys have gotten grounded so far. But I will definitely check in with our area Staff and get back to you and I will copy the appropriate Staff for the Board to let everyone know.

MR. GREEN: Through the Chair. Thank you. And, you know, it would make it a lot easier to make these decisions if we have good information. Right now we don't have good information. I'm not trying to discredit the proposal maker, but -- and I understand his experience in the field, but, still, extrapolated numbers, you know, they don't add up to moose meat. So it would really make sense to have some sort of a survey done.

Thank you, appreciate your time.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep. Any additional questions for the State.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. We'll move on to InterAgency Staff Committee comment, ISC Chair.

MS. WORKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The InterAgency Staff Committee offers the standard comment for WP20-41.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. We'll move on to Board discussion with Council Chair and State Liaison.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: With that we'll open up the floor for Federal Board action.

MR. PADGETT: Mr. Chair, Chad Padgett with BLM.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor, Chad.

MR. PADGETT: Thank you. I'd like to move to table this discussion, or this vote until tomorrow. Considering the time right now, 4:48 p.m., in addition, I'd like to have a little more time to confer with Staff.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We have a motion right now to table WP20-40 [sic] to a later date, can Chad get a second on that, I'm....

MR. STRIKER: Is it 40 or 41.

MS. WORKER: 41.

MR. PADGETT: I'm sorry, 41.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, 41, sorry, I'm -- WP20-41, sorry.

MR. PELTOLA: If BLM feels they need more time to determine action, BIA would second the motion to table it until tomorrow.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We have a motion on the floor to table this until we can construct a motion to a time to be determined later in this meeting, which would be tomorrow. Any opposition to that proposed motion?

(No opposition)

MR. SCHMID: This is Dave. No opposition but would like to take it up first thing in the morning, if we could stay with the agenda.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, I think both of those would be probably adequate if we -- we have two we tabled and maybe those could be the first
things we pick up in the morning.

MR. SIEKANIEC: This is Greg with the Fish and Wildlife Service, I would agree with that. I think that we should take up both of those immediately in the morning.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. Well, I think, you know, we still have 10 minutes to 5:00, I think, you know, we've been pushing it pretty hard today, we've taken minimal breaks, I think I'm going to call it for the day, if I'm not hearing any opposition.

MR. SIEKANIEC: No opposition, Mr. Chair.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Mr. Chair.

MS. PITKA: I support that.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead, Tom.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Mr. Chair. Could we just have a vote on the tabling until tomorrow for WP41, please.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, yeah, I thought I called that if there was no opposition that the motion carries unanimously, so I heard no discontent.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, so for the record there is no opposition to the motion to table on WP20-41 until tomorrow so we could frame the motion.

So we will be taking up those two tabled motions in the morning when we reconvene at 9:00 a.m.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you guys have a good day.

MR. PADGETT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
MR. SCHMID: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, have a good evening and everybody have a good night, see you tomorrow.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yep, see you in the morning.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Including Staff.

MS. PITKA: Good night.

(Off record)
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